DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 032 HE 028 148

TITLE	Accent on Quality. A Report of the Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee.
INSTITUTION	Alabama State Commission on Higher Education, Montgomery.
PUB DATE	Mar 95
NOTE	101p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Alabama Communication on Higher Education, 3465 Norman Bridge Rd., Montgomery, AL 36105-2310.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Policy; *Educational Quality; Governance; *Governing Boards; Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Alabama; *Alabama Commission on Higher Education

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, emphasizing the role and responsibilities of the Commission as specified in Alabama law. The Evaluation Committee sought perspective on the Commission's performance from a wide variety of educational, political, and civic leadership via a questionnaire, interviews, hearings, and document review. The report begins with an examination of context factors in evaluation, focusing on the educational context, financial context, legal context, and political context in Alabama. The report then evaluates leadership initiatives, leadership agenda, leadership impediments, leadership impact, the Commission's relationships with two-year colleges, Commission policy on off-campus courses and programs, and budget and formula funding responsibilities. Evaluation of the Commission's effectiveness reveals that additional attention is warranted in developing and implementing a long range plan for postsecondary education, developing and recommending legislation to ensure high quality education, and advising the governor. Recommendations are offered to the Commission and to political and civic/corporate leaders in Alabama. Appendices include: (1) a list of Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee members, (2) the survey questionnaire, (3) a list of those interviewed, (4) a chronology of the Knight versus Alabama case, and (5) verbatim reports of questionnaire open-ended responses. A separately bound executive summary precedes the full report. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 380 032

Accent on Quality

A Report of the
Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee
Alabama Commission on Higher Education
March 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alabama Commission on Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AE028 148

Accent on Quality

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Report of the
Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee
Alabama Commission on Higher Education
March 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BALANCING ADVOCACY AND ACCOUNTABILITY EXPECTATIONS

The requirement for an evaluation of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education is specified in Act No 79-461 of the Code of Alabama, the statute describing the role and duties of the Commission. Members of the Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee are found at the conclusion of this Executive Summary. This Executive Summary reflects major recommendations of the 1994 evaluation and some background related to those recommendations. A full copy of the report may be obtained from the Commission.

Whether any agency of higher education lives on a sharper knife edge than do coordinating commissions is doubtful. Coordinating organizations are charged with giving leadership in a context in which they must balance the advocacy expectations of institutions and systems and the accountability expectations of governors and legislators. They often operate within limited authority confines and rapidly changing political climates.

In what might be considered one of the more politically and educationally complex state climates in which to serve, the Alabama Commission on Higher Education is due commendation on several counts. The Commission is recognized by educational, civic, and political leaders for bringing additional clarity and equity in the unified budget recommendation; attempting to control course, program, and campus proliferation; and taking steps to control off-campus offerings. The Commission is widely perceived as trying to effectively balance concerns for institutions while asserting its own independence. And the Commission is seen as becoming a more assertive and astute player on the higher education scene in Alabama--earning increased regard from both campus officers and legislative/executive officers.

Many saluted the effectiveness of the Commission in operating an extensive statewide financial aid program, though recent changes in federal programs promise a dramatic change in the administration of loan programs and could result in significant downsizing of programs and staff in this area. The Commission has been designated as the State Postsecondary Review Entity (SPRE) for Alabama. Though guidelines for operation of the SPRE have been developed, the operation of the SPRE has just begun and thus it is premature to evaluate the Commission's responsibility in this role.

Finally, the Commission drew recognition for its operation of special programs such as the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR) and the Network of Alabama Academic Libraries.

The Committee believes that the Commission is discharging its responsibilities in a commendable fashion, given the complexity of the context in which it must work. The Committee further believes that the Commission has begun in recent actions to become appropriately assertive in its responsibilities. The Committee concludes, however, that the Commission has yet to realize the leadership promise that resides within its current pattern of authority and responsibility and that a more imaginative and aggressive use of its existing authority can work to the improvement of both efficiency and quality in Alabama higher education. The following recommendations suggest possible avenues of improvement designed to enhance both quality and management efficiency of Alabama higher education.

These recommendations are divided in two parts--those intended for Commission attention and those directed to political and civic/corporate leaders of the state.

ACTION AGENDA FOR THE COMMISSION

RECOMMENDATION ONE - That the Commission exert leadership to strengthen the sense of community in Alabama higher education, to promote a more effective "system" view and operation of Alabama Higher Education--a system in which each campus partner is respected for its unique contribution to the state and its citizens, is held responsible for both educational and financial stewardship and integrity, is intimately involved in the construction and implementation of a statewide long range plan for higher education, is treated with equity by financial and budgeting policies, and is expected to offer public evidence on the quality and effectiveness of its performance.

- Alabama has not yet realized an integrated "system" of higher education in which two-year colleges and senior colleges (1) respect the complementary roles for each, (2) demonstrate a pride in the achievements of each element of the system, and (3) respond to funding and other policy in some equitable fashion. Developing more constructive partnership relationships between the two-year college sector and the senior colleges and Commission is an imperative. A "community" of higher education, a high quality system of higher education, is not one in which dissent and argument are absent . . . but it is one in which disrespect and arrogance are absent.

RECOMMENDATION TWO - That the Commission revise its approach to formula funding and budgeting so that the policy and process (1) moves each campus in the state toward the same percentage of equity funding on SREB standards, (2) includes budget recommendations for each institution in the state in the unified budget recommendation--including each two-year institution as specified and required in the law establishing the Commission, and (3) arranges for an equitable consideration of both instate and out-of-state fee structures for each institution.

- The current "base plus" method of funding recommendations, which guarantees an institution its previous year's budget--regardless of enrollment fluctuation can distract from bringing all institutions to the SREB average on an equitable basis. The current range on the SREB average flows from 44.2% at one institution to 111.5% at another institution. This is an historic and complex equity challenge and the Commission staff is at work on the challenge.

The Commission is currently not making "separate" budget recommendations for each two-year college, as required by its own law. Instead the Commission is making a global recommendation for the entire two-year college system. There are several unfortunate effects of this practice. First, the Commission is failing to follow its own law. Second, the current approach invites the perception that the Commission is concerned with equity differences among four-year colleges, but not among two-year colleges.

Third, this approach represents an inconsistency in treatment of two-year and senior colleges. Fourth, by failing to follow its own law, the Commission invites legislative initiative that complicates its own work. Fifth, by ignoring equity issues in the two-year college sector, the Commission invites the possible enmity of the senior institutions. Finally, by failing to follow its own law, the Commission encourages the perception that it is a "paper tiger" or a "toothless tiger." It is not apparent that the Chancellor/executive staff of the two-year colleges and members of the State Board of Education are paying very careful governance attention to funding equity issues and funding balances, since there appear to be widespread differences in the financial health and fiscal postures of the two-year campuses.

RECOMMENDATION THREE - That the Commission develop the higher education information system that is specified in its law so that it will have an appropriate data base for long range planning, for enrollment studies and audits, for monitoring off-campus activities, for maintaining activity and

performance intelligence on the "Condition of Higher Education in Alabama," and for conducting other special studies that may be required within its statutes.

- It is difficult to ascertain why the Commission is over a quarter century into its life and responsibilities without having met this statutory responsibility. The answer certainly cannot be one of practical feasibility, since most other state coordinating agencies do maintain extensive and integrated information systems on enrollments, facilities, and finance. The development of a state level information system is in the best interest of all campuses and systems, since the ability to document trends in activity and achievement should promote the principles of resource equity and public trust, both essential to a high quality community of higher education.

RECOMMENDATION FOUR - That the Commission revise its policy and practice in reviewing and evaluating off-campus programs/courses so that review guidelines and policies: (a) allow quick response to need; (b) establish appropriate quality standards in staffing, support,and facilities; (c) encourage effective stewardship of financial resources; (d) minimize unnecessary paperwork and micromanagement tendencies; (e) place campuses on a performance expectation via possible spot audits; and (f) indicate consequences when a campus is found in violation of off-campus policy following a performance audit.

- While many saluted the Commission's initiative in reviewing off-campus offerings, most felt that the Commission had chosen an awkward management strategy to achieve a worthwhile goal. The current approach, requiring review of almost 3,000 courses each year, while a little over half of these may actually be offered, is seen by some as an example of Commission micromanagement. Development of appropriate quality and efficiency guidelines followed by spot performance audits is one approach that might work more effectively. There may be other more effective options.

But what argument can be offered for the Commission attempting to regulate quality and efficiency of off-campus courses, when the quality and efficiency of on-campus courses are not brought under similar scrutiny? Might it be argued that quality assurance of both on-campus and off-campus courses is a responsibility to be first felt by the institution, its governing board, and appropriate accrediting agencies? There is an appropriate leadership role for the Commission here, however, and that role will be explored in the following recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE - That the Commission take a more aggressive policy stance in promoting the nurture and demonstration of quality among all institutions in the State by: (a) Working with the systems and campuses in conducting a study of differential admissions standards for institutions of different missions; (b) Developing a policy that calls for institutions to design a cluster of performance indicators that would offer public evidence on quality as related to that campus's mission; (c) Establishing a cluster of statewide performance indicators that could be linked to the assessment of progress on statewide goals for higher education.

- In a high quality state system of higher education, each institution seeks excellence within its mission, shuns shoddy and shallow work, and rejoices in the achievements and quality of its partners. Any college or university that does not manifest quality and integrity within its mission should have its leadership changed or its doors closed.

A recent report of the Southern Regional Education Board indicates that Alabama is one of two states in the South that does not have a state level performance indicator system in place. A good argument can be made that a college and a state that has performance intelligence--public evidence if you will--on its activity and achievement can make more informed decisions about goals, policy, and financial support than a campus or state having little or no systematic information. Public evidence of quality encourages public trust.

RECOMMENDATION SIX - That the Commission establish a moratorium on the expansion of existing institutional missions to new degree levels, and the acquisition/creation of new campuses until the Commission, governing boards, and institutions have constructed a Master Plan whose goals and value commitments are endorsed and supported by the entire higher education community.

- Development of a long range plan for higher education in a state can be seen as an exercise in busy work, something to be endured, finished and placed on a shelf. Or it can be seen as a critical instrument in developing an agenda of common goals and values--an instrument for promotion of community, an instrument for the orchestration of consent and dissent, an instrument for building an integrated system, and an instrument for promoting quality. Without active participation of the entire higher education community, planning is less likely to result in the achievement of important outcomes of both product and process. The Committee does not believe that long range planning in Alabama has reached its promise for uniting the system of higher education in common cause. Long range planning is a statutory responsibility of the Commission whose full potential is yet to be realized.

RECOMMENDATION SEVEN - That the current statutory requirement mandating Senate confirmation of the Executive Director of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education be eliminated.

- The law requiring confirmation of the Commission executive officer seriously confines and affects the Commission in the single most important responsibility and power of a lay board--the power to appoint and remove its own executive. This is a notable political curiosity, a requirement not found in any other state having a coordinating board or council. Several of those interviewed referred to the Commission as a "toothless tiger." While the Committee does not agree with that assessment, clearly it would be difficult for any governance entity to get a "bite" or grip on its responsibilities if the Senate threatened to pull its teeth every four years. Why create an agency of government to perform a work and then impede its potency with this requirement.

The second effect of the confirmation requirement is that the Executive Director of the Commission effectively has two bosses--the lay members of the Commission and members of the Senate. The dignity test, the reciprocity test, offers a simple standard, beyond that of political good sense, by which to evaluate the confirmation requirement. How many college presidents or system presidents in Alabama would like to work under such dual performance expectations and political review every four years?

RECOMMENDATION EIGHT - That the governance of the two-year college system in Alabama be invested in a newly created Board for Two-year College Campuses, with appointments of board members by the Governor.

- Having the governance responsibility for the two-year college system tucked in with the elementary and secondary school system is a disadvantage in coordinating the interests of higher education. Moreover, it invites political complication, fails to recognize the important mission of the two-year college sector, and does not furnish adequate opportunity for appropriate lay governance involvement in oversight of the system.

No theme was more frequently presented to the Evaluation Committee than the history, performance, and promise of the state's two-year college system. The two-year college system was seen as "out of control, overbuilt, highly politicized, a source of educational and political incest, a system with questionable educational quality and management integrity." Officers of the two-year college system and campuses had equally acidic terms to describe

their detractors. And this is why the Committee is emphasizing the importance of community in the construction of a high quality state system of higher education.

Two-year colleges are a major American innovation in higher education and have made notable contributions to the policy goal of enhancing access and promoting economic development. Most states properly and proudly consider their two-year college system a critical and central partner in their overall system of higher education. There is no room in a truly excellent system of higher education for second class citizens. Each campus and each system must be recognized for its unique mission and held accountable for quality and integrity against that mission. Creating a new appointed lay governance board for two-year colleges would be an organizational step in salute and support of community, quality, and management integrity for higher education in Alabama.

RECOMMENDATION NINE - That the state adopt legislation to promote long range facility planning, lease, acquisition, and/or construction.

- Alabama apparently has no system to control the planning and funding of facilities on college campuses. Apparently any institution with a budget surplus or with bonding option can arrange for, construct, and/or lease a facility without state approval or oversight. The construction and/or lease of facilities can therefore proceed without state level assessment of need or impact on operational budgets of campuses. In many states, the coordinating commission is given responsibility for maintaining a facilities data system on size, type/function, and age of square footage so that it can make both operating and capital budget recommendations to the governor and legislature.

RECOMMENDATION TEN - That the Governor of the State take leadership in working with legislative and educational leaders in fashioning a resolution of the Title VI suit and submitting a proposed resolution to the court that will be endorsed by the Alabama Commission and all of higher education in the state.

- Members of the Evaluation Committee believe that the interest and will of the higher education community to establish a sense of partnership are more likely to produce a reasonable solution to the Title VI issue than action of the courts, since court mandates are more likely to leave some party in continued appeal and contention, in which the only winners (at least financially) are the attorneys for the contending parties.

Historically black institutions in the South were indeed born of prejudice, and historic white institutions did indeed exhibit prejudice. As with other moments and institutions in the history of human endeavor, however, what

some intend for meanness has often been turned to nobility. Historically black institutions have educated generations of black Americans and have therefore earned the allegiance of those for whom they provided care and encouragement. Today historic white institutions are increasingly places of choice for black students. There is a place and a mission for both institutions, as states move to promote desregation. A commanding goal is to guarantee that students of any race are treated with dignity and challenged by expectations of quality and responsibility wherever they may enroll.

The Evaluation Committee commends the active engagement of the Commission and the higher education community, the active involvement of the Governor and officers of the legislature in developing a plan for Alabama higher education, one that respects the past as it reaches for a more promising future for all Alabamians.

ENHANCING THE FUTURE OF ALABAMA HIGHER EDUCATION

Having suggested several issues and leadership challenges of critical import for the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, the Committee would be remiss if it did not again accent the many compliments accorded the Commission, its staff, and its Executive Director. Some felt that the Commission's action had avoided "chaos" in higher education, and that, as we earlier noted, the Commission was becoming a more assertive and astute player on the higher education scene--earning increased regard from both campus officers and legislative/executive officers.

These achievements and perceptions will be all the more notable, given the complications of the educational, legal, and political context in which the Commission must do its work. The Evaluation Committee affirms leadership on the part of the Commission as a major hope for enhancing both the management efficiency and the educational effectiveness of Alabama higher education.

SIXTH QUADRENNIAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Dr. E. Grady Bogue, Professor
Leadership Studies in Education
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996
(Chair of the Committee)

Chancellor Emeritus
Louisiana State University
in Shreveport
Shreveport, La 71115

Dr. Marilyn Clark Beck, President
Lord Fairfax Community College
Middleton, VA 22645

Paul Davis, Publisher
The Auburn Bulletin/Eagle
P. O. Box 3240
Auburn, AL 36830

Mr. Sabert Oglesby
1348 Panorama Drive
Birmingham, AL 35216

President Emeritus
Southern Research Institute
Birmingham, AL 35255

Mr. Fred Sheheen
Commissioner of Higher Education
South Carolina Commission
on Higher Education
1333 Main Street, Suite 200
Columbia, SC 29201

Dr. Walter Washington
6017 Woodlea Road
Jackson, MS 39206

President Emeritus
Alcorn State University
Lorman, MS 39090

Alabama Commission On Higher Education
3465 Norman Bridge Road
Montgomery, Al 36105-2310
(334) 281-1921

Alabama Commission on Higher Education
3465 Norman Bridge Road
Montgomery, Alabama 36105-2310
(334) 281-1921

ACCENT ON QUALITY

A REPORT OF THE
SIXTH QUADRENNIAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

A Committee to Evaluate the Effectiveness
of the
Alabama Commission on Higher Education

March 1995

ALABAMA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
SIXTH QUADRENNIAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

P.O. Box 250128
Montgomery, Alabama 36125
(205) 281-1921 ATTNET 285-0111 FAX 281-6711

March 1995

The Honorable Fob James
Governor of Alabama
State Capitol
Montgomery, AL 36130

Dear Governor James:

The members of the committee to evaluate the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, created pursuant to Section 12 Act 79-461, are pleased to submit to you this report.

As further required by law, we are mailing copies of this report directly to members of the Legislature and the presidents and governing boards of the institutions of higher education in Alabama, and it is being made available to the general public.

Respectfully,

Dr. E. Grady Bogue, Chair
Professor, Leadership Studies in Education
The University of Tennessee

Dr. Grady Bogue, Chair
Dr. Marilyn Beck
Mr. Paul Davis
Mr. Sabert Oglesby
Mr. Fred Sheheen
Dr. Walter Washington

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	The Leadership Challenge of Multiple Constituencies: Performance Evaluation in Context	1
II.	Commission Effectiveness: Balancing Advocacy and Accountability Expectations	17
III.	Affirmation and Action: A Leadership Agenda	37
Appendix A:	Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee Membership, Position, Addresses	41
Appendix B:	Survey Questionnaire	45
Appendix C:	List of Those Interviewed by the Evaluation Committee	49
Appendix D:	A Chronology of the Knight V. Alabama Case	55
Appendix E:	Verbatim Reports of Questionnaire Open-Ended Response	67

I.

THE LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE OF MULTIPLE CONSTITUENCIES

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN CONTEXT

> Two years after the establishment of the Commission and during the last year of each gubernatorial term, the Commission shall appoint a committee of at least three consultants who are not associated with higher education in this state to evaluate the effectiveness of the work of the Commission and to recommend changes as needed. A report prepared by the Committee shall be submitted to the governor, the legislature, the presidents and governing boards of the public institutions of higher education of this state and the public.

This requirement for an evaluation of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education is built into Act No 79-461 of the Code of Alabama, the statute describing the role and duties of the Commission. Membership, appointment, and addresses of the six members of the Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee may be found in Appendix A to this report.

An evaluation of any organized entity is a complex philosophical and technical challenge, and on occasion a moral challenge as well. Is it appropriate or moral, for example, to evaluate either individuals or organizations on criteria and standards that are not public and clearly known to all parties? Thus, there is first the question of criteria by which the evaluation is to be conducted. There is second the question of performance standard, the question of what is acceptable performance. And there is the question of who is in position to render these judgements.

Nor can any group of evaluators hope to spend limited time in limited contact in a state and hope to understand the complex history of that state as well as those who have lived and labored there. Those who are asked to evaluate, therefore, are well advised to approach their work with some sensitivity to the limitations of their discoveries and to the limited grasp of reality that may emerge from those discoveries.

For this Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation, the Committee has attempted to link the evaluation as close as possible to the role and responsibilities of the Commission as specified in the law. The Committee sought perspective on the Commission's performance from a wide variety of educational, political, and civic leadership via

a questionnaire and interviews. The questionnaire employed in the survey may be found in Appendix B to this report, and a list of those interviewed may be found in Appendix C. Hearings were held in Montgomery, Birmingham, Huntsville, and Mobile. In addition, the Committee reviewed a wide array of documents and reports related to the Commission's work and to higher education in Alabama. The result of these inquiries may be found in Section II of the report, and recommendations in Section III.

To anticipate the spirit and substance of our findings and recommendations, the Committee is not recommending new authority for the Commission, with one exception in the area of facilities planning. The Committee is urging a more assertive and imaginative use of existing authority and more active Commission leadership on qualitative issues. Finally the Committee is commending a few strategic policy and governance changes for political leaders in Alabama, changes designed to promote a more effective and efficient system of higher education for the state.

CONTEXTUAL FACTORS IN EVALUATION

The most obvious and most logical basis on which to evaluate the performance of an organization is on the accomplishment of its mission and goals. Thus, the test of results is a foundation test. Not all is quite that simple, however, when one is dealing with the complexity of human and organizational performance. Placing a value judgement on an organization's performance—the work of evaluation—should not be done without due consideration of the context in which the organization is doing its work. The Committee, therefore, would like to take note of this context as a beginning point of its work.

American education is, in many ways, a moral and political enterprise; that is, defining educational goals and arranging for their implementation involve more than professional judgement. Educators at every level, including higher education, must live close to the feet of the people. By design, lay boards have governing responsibilities for schools and colleges, and the governance roles of these lay boards is a distinctive feature of American education. In addition, the purpose and performance of public schools and colleges is subject to review in the forum of the people, in our state and national legislatures.

Whether any agency of higher education lives on a sharper knife edge than do coordinating commissions is doubtful. Coordinating organizations are charged with giving leadership in a context in which they must balance the advocacy expectations of campuses and systems and the accountability expectations of governors and legislators. They often operate within limited authority confines.

Coordinating agencies such as the Alabama Commission on Higher Education must also perform their duties in frequently changing financial and political climates. The goals and style of both governors and legislatures can alter dramatically in a single election. As with any other enterprise, the quality of Commission performance is dependent not only upon the support received from both educational colleagues and political leadership in the state but also upon the quality of executive staff and the quality of those lay men and women appointed as Commissioners. This complexity of role expectation and constituent expectation constitutes a complex performance climate and context indeed. Let us then examine the context in which the Alabama Commission on Higher Education is expected to work.

THE EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT IN ALABAMA

Other evaluation committees have concluded that Alabama has too many institutions of higher education, and indeed many interviewed in this sixth quadrennial evaluation were of the same opinion. Public commentary on the number of institutions and the political complexity of higher education in the state can be found in interesting context. In an editorial appearing in the December 8, 1994 issue of the Birmingham News and entitled "Who needs the Legislature?", the News commented on legal challenges in the last elections and noted that without certification of winners, no one has been elected. The News commented further: "But there are other ways to spot our Legislature's demise." Included among several "tongue-in cheek" evidences of the Legislature's demise were these two indicators: "Not one new junior college has been started" and "No one has put a lobbyist or legislative leader on the board of trustees of a major state university." However, whether Alabama has too many colleges and universities, depends, as we earlier noted, on the standard selected for making the judgement. With a population base almost a million less than Tennessee (AL 4.0 million, TN 4.9 million), Alabama has 16 universities and 32 two-year colleges compared to Tennessee's 10 universities and 14 two-year colleges. However, one must be careful with such comparisons as Tennessee operates a large number of postsecondary vocational schools. While these vocational schools come under the governance of the Tennessee Board of Regents, they are not degree granting schools.

North Carolina has a population of 6.6 million and only 18 four-year universities, but 58 two-year colleges. With a population of 4.2 million, Louisiana has 14 four-year schools but only 6 two-year colleges. One may well make the argument that if a state has to be in a deficit or excess position in terms of colleges the latter may be preferred in terms of the social and economic welfare of a state. Indeed, Alabamians may take pleasure in their success in pursuing the goal of enhanced access. Approximately 220,000 students enrolled in Alabama colleges

in the fall of 1994, a figure which compares favorably with many states on enrollment per capita.

While the two-year college system came in for extended discussion concerning number of schools, colleagues in the four-year sector can hardly afford to throw stones. In the last two years, for example, a private, two-year college (Walker College) has been taken into the public system, as a campus of the University of Alabama at Birmingham, a move that stretches educational logic when one examines the mission and location of UAB, but yields to political logic when one examines the series of events that led to this decision, which the Commission supported. This acquisition was preceded by the acquisition and transformation of Athens College, a four-year private college, into Athens State College, a public four-year campus in 1975. This acquisition was opposed by the Commission.

Wallace College at Hanceville apparently aspires to become a four-year college. Whether additional expansion of the four-year sector will occur with this transformation apparently remains an open question in the state—with sharp variance in opinion concerning the probabilities of this transformation. In an interview with the Committee, a state legislator began by expressing serious concern about the number of colleges in the state, his initial opinion being that the system was seriously overextended. However, he did not find it inconsistent to justify the expansion of Wallace-Hanceville to four-year status and its placement in the Auburn system. Members of the Committee understand that another plan is being advanced to place Wallace-Hanceville with the University of North Alabama.

There are two important issues, however, that do attend the state attempting to operate this number of schools. The State of Alabama is one of approximately a dozen states appropriating more than one billion dollars a year for higher education purposes (see Table I in the following discussion). But this commendable expression of financial support is being spread over many schools. Whether these funds are being applied with efficiency in the case of some campus arrangements is open to question. The number of small enrollment schools can encourage high administrative costs. The two-year college system has made a commendable step to consolidate some of the institutions (down from 42 in 1989 to 32 in 1994), but it will take time to realize operating efficiencies from these mergers.

While complex, the governance structure of Alabama's colleges and universities is not more complex that many other states having combinations of single-campus and multi-campus governing boards with a coordinating commission. The second and perhaps more important contextual challenge is that Alabama has not yet constructed an integrated "system" of higher education in which two-year colleges and senior colleges (1) respect the complementary roles for each,

(2) demonstrate a pride in the achievements of each element in the system, and (3) celebrate the quality that should be inherent in each mission rather than developing "peck orders" of quality, with research universities on the top and two-year colleges on the bottom. Developing this "system" or community of higher education certainly depends upon the leadership of the Commission on Higher Education, but cannot be realized without partnership contributions from governing board and institutional leadership as well.

To put the matter plainly, in a high quality state system of higher education, each campus seeks excellence within its mission, shuns shoddy and shallow work, and rejoices in the achievements and quality of its partners. In a high quality state system of higher education, there is no place for "second class" campuses. There is no "flagship." There are research universities, doctoral universities, comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, two-year technical and community colleges—each with a different, important, and unique mission. And any one of those colleges or universities that does not manifest quality within that mission should have its leadership changed or its doors closed.

A high quality state system of higher education is one in which dissent and argument are welcome, but arrogance and disrespect concerning role and mission are not. A high quality state system of higher education is one in which integrity of both personnel and program performance is essential. Any departure from administrative or educational integrity is a departure from quality. We will engage this issue in a subsequent section of the report. Here we only note that the Committee could not discern that mutual respect for different missions and different contributions existed among the institutions, their boards, and the Commission. Developing a keener sense of teamwork and partnership is a long term occupation, one that the Commission has commendably engaged, but one that remains a notable leadership challenge for all of Alabama higher education.

THE FINANCIAL CONTEXT IN ALABAMA

In some ways, Alabamians can be pleased with the manner in which the State has supported higher education in recent years. Table I is taken from the October 19, 1994 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education. These data reveal that Alabama is one of 13 states in the country that appropriated over a billion dollars for higher education in 1994-95. Alabama keeps company with North Carolina, Georgia, Texas, and Florida in the southeast. The two year percentage increase for higher education in Alabama (1993-94 to 1994-95) ranked Alabama second in the nation. However, it is important to realize that the comparative analysis of financial data among states can be a complex exercise.

Expenditures for education of prisoners may be carried under "Corrections" in one state and under "Higher Education" in another state. Funds for support of teaching hospitals may be carried under "Higher Education" in one state and under "Health Care" in another.

The state of Alabama supports education at all levels through an earmarked revenue source designated the Alabama Special Education Trust Fund. In recent years, there has been a general understanding that elementary and secondary would be allocated about two thirds of the trust fund and higher education has been allocated close to one third of that fund. In 1994-95, approximately $3.3 billion were appropriated based on revenue estimates from the trust fund. In Alabama, however, there is apparently no consensus revenue estimate agreed to by executive and legislative branches of government so that prorations (budget reductions following appropriation) have often placed institutions in difficult management posture following the appropriation.

As a point in passing, the allocation balance between K-12 and higher education may come under tension related to current court actions concerning funding equity in K-12. Like many other states in the union, poor school systems with limited tax bases are asking why their children should be funded at support levels dramatically different from more affluent school districts. Readers interested in both a quantitative and qualitative exploration of this national issue at the K-12 level will find Jonathan Kozol's book Savage Inequalities reading that is both informing and disturbing. We will have more to say on the legal issues in the following discussion.

Table II is taken from a Southern Regional Education Board publication entitled SREB Fact Book on Higher Education (1994). This table indicates that Alabama appropriates the highest percent of state taxes to higher education of any state in the southeast. Except for Arkansas, Alabama higher education enjoyed the highest percent increase in state appropriations during the decade 1982-83 to 1992-93.

TABLE I

STATE APPROPRIATIONS RANK

HOW THE STATES RANK					
	1994-95 appropriations		2-year change		
	Amount	Rank	not adjusted for inflation	adjusted for inflation	Rank
Alabama	$ 1,016,104,000	13	+23%	+17%	2
Alaska	171,460,000	42	-2	-7	42
Arizona	665,461,000	22	+9	+3	20
Arkansas	418,680,000	34	+3	-3	36
California	4,748,746,000	1	-6	-11	46
Colorado	543,690,000	28	+3	-3	35
Connecticut	500,315,000	31	+15	+9	8
Delaware	137,432,000	44	+12	+6	14
Florida	1,695,700,000	6	+16	+10	7
Georgia	1,119,936,000	11	+19	+13	5
Hawaii	386,023,000	36	+5	-1	29
Idaho	226,908,000	39	+19	+13	4
Illinois	1,894,531,000	4	+9	+3	19
Indiana	923,506,000	17	+3	-3	34
Iowa	641,207,000	24	+6	0	27
Kansas	502,354,000	30	+7	+1	24
Kentucky	657,609,000	23	+8	+2	22
Louisiana	589,578,000	27	+2	-3	38
Maine	173,020,000	41	+1	-5	40
Maryland	788,187,000	20	+5	-1	30
Massachusetts*	902,934,000	18	n/c	n/c	n/c
Michigan	1,607,578,000	7	+4	-2	33
Minnesota	1,030,819,000	12	+7	+1	25

Mississippi	628,607,000	26	+45	+37	1
Missouri	672,839,000	21	+14	+8	10
Montana	113,156,000	47	-8	-13	48
Nebraska	369,565,000	37	+4	-1	32
Nevada	194,439,000	40	-6	-11	47
New Hampshire	85,324,000	49	+15	+9	9
New Jersey	1,259,340,000	10	+2	-3	39
New Mexico	437,501,000	32	+20	+13	3
New York	3,106,507,000	3	+12	+6	15
North Carolina	1,723,312,000	5	+12	+6	16
North Dakota	143,864,000	43	-5	-10	45
Ohio	1,559,722,000	9	+13	+7	13
Oklahoma	540,887,000	29	-3	-8	44
Oregon	434,654,000	33	-10	-15	49
Pennsylvania	1,580,984,000	8	+11	+5	18
Rhode Island	125,034,000	46	+16	+10	6
South Carolina	634,463,000	25	+3	-3	37
South Dakota	112,923,000	48	+8	+2	23
Tennessee	864,461,000	19	+14	+7	11
Texas	3,109,347,000	2	+11	+5	17
Utah	397,539,000	35	+13	+7	12
Vermont	53,222,000	50	-2	-7	43
Virginia	976,899,000	15	+4	-1	31
Washington	942,842,000	16	-1	-6	41
West Virginia	303,874,000	38	+7	+1	26
Wisconsin	979,269,000	14	+8	+3	21
Wyoming	128,680,000	45	+5	0	28
Total U.S.	**$42,821,032,000**		**+8%**	**+2%**	

SOURCE: The Chronicle of Higher Education
October 19, 1994

Table III indicates that Alabama is below the southern regional average in expenditures per student. If the state is making good effort, which would appear to be the case from Tables I and II, where is the money going. Perhaps Table IV will help with some of this mystery. For four-year campuses, it would appear that a large portion of expenditures is going to support hospitals, apparently at UAB and USA. There are, apparently, other expenditures carried in the Alabama higher education appropriation that are not found in this appropriation category for other states.

THE LEGAL CONTEXT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Earlier we noted two current legal cases that affect higher education, one involving equity funding for K-12 and one involving desegregation and Title VI for higher education. Both of these challenges add complexity to the work of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education.

One legislator who interviewed with the Committee noted that Alabama seemed to be unusually occupied with federal legal actions. The state is apparently in court with its mental health system, the prison system, the elementary and secondary education system, and its higher education system. A civic leader and board member suggested that the state agencies seemed to be preoccupied with suing one another, with the only obvious winner in these contests being attorneys. Now back to the issue at hand.

If the state is to furnish additional support to K-12 as a means of resolving equity and adequacy funding issues there, would the proportion of the Special Education Trust Fund historically allocated to higher education be vulnerable? A recent letter issued by the presidents of four-year institutions anticipates a possible tension building between K-12 and higher education and reflects the concern of the presidents in avoiding a clash of interests between K-12 and higher education. The Committee salutes the spirit of that letter. We have mentioned the merit of building a keener sense of system and community for higher education. That principle would also extend to K-12. American education is a seamless fabric in which access, support, and quality at every level affect other levels. It makes good sense to look at the "community" of education in a state and to fashion qualitative and support goals that advance the entire community.

TABLE II

HIGHER EDUCATION-RELATED STATE APPROPRIATIONS AS A PERCENT OF STATE TAXES

	1971-72	1976-77	1981-82	1986-87	1991-92
United States	12.6	13.7	14.1	13.1	12.2
SREB States	13.2	15.3	16.6	15.6	13.9
Alabama	12.7	17.8	17.2	17.3	19.4
Arkansas	11.2	14.3	14.6	14.5	13.9
Florida	11.6	13.3	14.4	13.0	10.0
Georgia	13.3	13.9	15.2	13.4	12.0
Kentucky	11.9	13.2	13.6	13.0	12.6
Louisiana	13.0	12.5	14.5	15.7	13.9
Maryland	10.7	11.5	12.1	11.0	11.0
Mississippi	14.0	15.9	20.6	16.8	15.8
North Carolina	14.9	17.1	20.0	18.8	16.0
Oklahoma	12.6	13.4	12.0	14.4	14.0
South Carolina	13.6	17.7	18.4	16.5	15.5
Tennessee	12.7	14.8	17.1	16.9	15.0
Texas	16.5	19.3	20.9	19.1	16.6
Virginia	12.3	15.4	16.8	16.3	13.7
West Virginia	13.7	13.8	13.1	13.2	12.1

Notes: State appropriations **exclude** dollars for capital outlay and debt service. Also excluded are monies from sources other than state tax funds, including all monies from federal sources, local sources, and student fees. The amounts **include** funds for medical and health programs, state-level student financial aid programs, state funds for private higher education, and state funds for higher education coordinating or governing boards.

SOURCES: Edward R. Hines, *Appropriations of State Tax Funds for Operating Expenses of Higher Education*, various years (Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges); Edward R. Hines, *State Higher Education Appropriations*, various years, (Denver, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers); U.S. Bureau of the Census, *State Government Finances*, various years (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office).

TABLE III

State and Local Educational and General Operating Appropriations and Appropriations per Full Time Equivalent Student Public Colleges and Universities

	Appropriation 1993-94 (000s)	Appropriations Per Full-Time-Equivalent Student by Type of Institution								
		Four Year*							Two Year	
		All	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2
SREB States	$11,402,919	$4,912	$6,143	$5,220	$4,340	$3,806	$3,732	$3,848	$3,382	$4,328
Alabama	612,108**	4,413	5,257	4,675	4,188	3,265	3,953	2,689	2,499	3,078
Arkansas	291,201	4,463	5,991	na	4,374	3,372	3,793	4,224	3,853	-
Florida	1,564,302	6,553	7,065	6,969	5,745	5,924	na	na	3,376	3,648
Georgia	878,765	4,062	7,115	6,672	3,663	3,524	3,681	3,603	3,222	4,428
Kentucky	448,173	4,143	4,448	5,079	3,860	3,678	2,705	8,181	2,093	8,858
Louisiana	469,679	3,269	4,873	2,922	3,513	2,328	2,734	na	2,148	4,858
Maryland	613,617	5,885	8,128	na	5,162	4,398	4,518	6,321	3,373	na
Mississippi	306,810	3,975	4,220	4,152	3,645	na	3,630	3,345	2,893	na
North Carolina	1,147,447	6,348	7,728	5,767	5,539	4,953	6,742	7,128	3,656	na
Oklahoma	410,301	4,145	5,507	na	2,558	3,081	3,284	3,156	3,099	na
South Carolina	448,902	4,479	5,798	5,193	4,178	na	3,364	3,213	3,736	na
Tennessee	638,073	5,108	6,645	5,631	4,214	4,613	4,352	na	3,112	4,650
Texas	2,708,949	5,164	6,600	5,527	4,243	4,599	8,349	3,927	4,060	na
Virginia	675,404	3,763	4,322	4,088	2,622	2,826	3,076	2,989	2,548	na
West Virginia	189,188	3,412	3,888	na	3,267	na	na	3,074	2,423	-

SOURCE: SREB-State Data Exchange, 1993-94.

*The numbers for four-year institutions represent in order doctoral universities (1,2,3), masters level universities (4,5) and baccalaureate colleges (6)

**The total appropriation here differs from the approximately $1.0 billion shown in Table I because appropriations for state level coordination, health related instruction and selected agricultural appropriations are not included here.

TABLE IV
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF CURRENT FUNDS EXPENDITURES
PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

1991-92								
	Instruction	Research	Public Service	Educ & Gen Support	Plant Oper & Maint	Auxiliary Enterprises	Hospitals	All Other
United States	32.7	10.5	4.4	18.3	8.3	11.9	10.3	3.6
SREB States	33.3	10.2	5.4	16.8	8.5	12.9	9.7	3.2
Alabama	30.4	8.3	7.1	15.3	6.3	9.2	21.1	2.3
Arkansas	32.9	10.0	6.1	17.0	7.2	14.2	8.0	4.7
Florida	40.6	15.0	3.8	20.9	8.4	9.6	0.0	1.7
Georgia	33.2	14.9	6.8	18.3	8.7	9.1	8.2	0.8
Kentucky	32.2	8.4	7.6	20.8	7.7	9.5	8.2	5.5
Louisiana	30.6	8.6	8.7	18.1	9.4	16.7	6.1	1.9
Maryland	29.2	11.2	0.1	16.2	10.1	9.8	20.7	2.7
Mississippi	29.0	10.6	6.2	15.1	6.1	14.1	11.8	7.1
North	36.7	11.9	9.5	14.8	7.8	13.7	0.0	5.8
Oklahoma	31.5	9.2	5.7	11.8	7.7	26.7	5.5	1.8
South	30.8	8.2	8.6	16.4	8.2	12.7	13.6	1.5
Tennessee	37.7	5.7	2.8	18.5	8.1	12.5	12.4	2.3
Texas	36.6	10.9	3.6	16.1	11.0	13.0	5.2	3.7
Virginia	27.4	8.1	4.0	16.7	5.8	12.7	22.5	2.7
West Virginia	28.4	6.2	4.2	18.0	8.7	17.0	11.9	5.6

1991-92								
	Instruction	Research	Public Service	Educ & Gen Support	Plant Oper & Maint	Auxiliary Enterprises	Hospitals	All Other
United States	28.9	11.7	4.6	17.2	5.8	10.2	12.8	8.8
SREB States	29.8	11.9	5.7	15.9	5.8	11.3	11.4	8.2
Alabama	21.6	10.5	6.3	13.3	4.5	7.4	29.4	7.1
Arkansas	23.9	8.2	4.8	14.3	5.1	11.9	21.6	10.1
Florida	32.5	17.7	7.0	20.7	5.9	10.8	0.0	5.4
Georgia	29.8	17.5	6.2	17.2	6.8	7.8	11.1	3.5
Kentucky	28.3	7.5	8.6	17.1	5.4	8.2	14.2	10.0
Louisiana	29.3	11.9	7.2	17.1	5.7	12.3	8.3	8.3
Maryland	32.1	13.1	1.3	19.6	6.8	13.5	3.6	0.0
Mississippi	25.4	11.7	5.2	15.7	5.3	13.3	13.4	10.0
North	32.9	11.3	11.7	14.4	6.6	14.8	0.0	8.4
Oklahoma	31.7	10.8	6.5	14.9	5.4	15.8	0.0	15.1
South	26.8	8.6	6.6	14.1	5.6	10.6	23.5	4.3
Tennessee	30.7	9.1	5.3	16.2	5.1	10.0	17.4	6.1
Texas	34.1	13.4	3.7	15.5	6.7	10.0	6.1	10.5
Virginia	25.1	9.4	3.0	13.7	4.1	14.2	25.2	5.2
West Virginia	34.0	8.1	4.6	17.7	8.1	14.1	0.0	13.5

Source: SREB Fact Book, 1994.

In a second legal action, the case of Knight vs Alabama originated in 1978 from a Title VI investigation of Alabama higher education by the U. S. Office of Civil Rights. In the most recent action, the Appellate Court has remanded the case to the Northern District of Alabama, Judge Harold Murphy presiding. The chronology of events surrounding this case may be found in Appendix D, which details the path the case has taken up and down the federal legal system. Again, to this point, the only obvious beneficiaries in this case so far would appear to be attorneys.

Judge Murphy has commissioned a panel of four out-of-state higher education experts to assist him in the remand action. They are Dr. Robert M. Anderson, Jr., Dr. Harold L. Enarson, Dr. Robben W. Fleming, and Dr. Bryce Jordan, all well known voices in American higher education. Members of the Committee understand that the staff of the Commission has been trying to assist in the formation of a consent action or possible resolution of the case. While the Committee salutes this informal leadership initiative of the Commission, the resolution of Title VI issues continues to challenge several states—including Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. Other states move in and out of courts as circumstances and actors change.

The resolution of Title VI issues is a challenge where thoughtful and strong gubernatorial leadership could play a major role, as the contending parties among the state's colleges and universities continue to keep the suit alive. The continued aggravation of court action—of findings, appeals, and remands—not only costs the state of Alabama money that could and should be flowing into the enhancement of programs and quality rather than to litigation fees, it keeps the entire system of higher education in a moment of program and policy suspension. Thus, it is in the best interest of the State of Alabama to insure a speedy resolution.

We believe that the interest and will of the higher education community to nurture a sense of community and partnership is more likely to produce a reasonable solution than action of the courts, since court mandates are more likely to leave some party in continued appeal and contention. We further believe that the interests of the higher education community should focus on the needs of students first and the needs/enhancement of institutions second.

Attempts to desegregate higher education will always prove complex and challenging because the selection of institutions and programs is first and foremost a matter of student election and choice. Whether any solution—program enhancement, financial enhancement, physical plant enhancement, even merger—will change the dominant enrollment of either historically black or white institutions is problematic.

Historically black institutions in the South were indeed born of prejudice, and historically white institutions did indeed exhibit prejudice. As with other historic

moments and institutions in the history of human endeavor, however, what some intend for meanness has often been turned to nobility. This is clearly the case with our historic black institutions of higher education. They have educated generations of black Americans and have therefore earned the allegiance of those for whom they provided care and encouragement. And historically white institutions are increasingly places of choice for black students. There is a place and room for both institutions, as states move to promote desegregation. A more commanding goal is to guarantee that students of any race or gender are treated with dignity wherever they may enroll.

The Committee commends the active engagement of both the higher education community and legislative/executive officers—including the active and aggressive support of the governor—in developing a plan for Alabama higher education, one that respects the past as it reaches for a more promising future for all Alabamians. This plan should be one in which all students are treated with dignity and challenged by quality. A plan enjoying the endorsement and the allegiance of the entire Alabama higher education community and Alabama civic/political leadership is a plan more likely to produce positive and stable results than a plan imposed or mandated by the Court. The Commission can play an important role in bringing together the educational and political leadership of the state and in fashioning a consent solution that the Court and the State would find satisfying.

THE POLITICAL CONTEXT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

In examining the political context in which the Commission is asked to work, the Committee concludes that Alabama presents a politically complex challenge. The first evidence of this complexity is that the Executive Director of the Commission must be affirmed every four years by the Alabama Senate:

> The appointment of the executive officer shall be subject to confirmation of the Senate each four years beginning with the Regular Session of 1981. Failure of the senate to confirm the executive officer shall result in his or her dismissal within ninety (90) days thereafter. (Section 16-5-3, paragraph (d), Code of Alabama)

There are several unfortunate effects associated with this requirement. The law seriously confines and affects the Commission in the single most important responsibility and power of a lay board—the power to appoint and remove its own executive. This is a notable political curiosity, a requirement not found in any other state having a coordinating commission or council. Several of those interviewed by the Committee referred to the Commission as a "toothless tiger." While we do not agree with that assessment, clearly it would be difficult for any governance

entity to get a "bite" or grip on its responsibilities if the Senate threatened to pull its teeth every four years. The effect of this act is to impede the effectiveness of the Commission, also a curious political act. Why create an agency of government to perform a work and then impede its potency with such a requirement.

The second effect of the confirmation requirement is that the Executive Director of the Commission effectively has two bosses—the lay members of the Commission and the members of the Senate. Dissenting colleagues may contribute to the Executive Director's discomfort and even his demise not by confronting his immediate supervisors, the lay members of the Commission, but by route of political influence. The dignity test, the reciprocity test, offers a simple standard by which to evaluate the confirmation requirement. How many college presidents or system presidents in Alabama would like to work under such political review every four years?

Writing in a monograph entitled Choosing Quality, published in 1987 by the Education Commission of the States, well known and respected collegiate educator and executive Frank Newman suggests that many states simply do not exhibit the aspiration to have a higher education system of quality. They have mediocrity by choice. Every policy related to higher education in a state supports or impedes the cause of quality in its colleges and universities. Is requiring Senate confirmation of the Commission Executive Director a policy choice that supports quality or is it one that invites mediocrity in Alabama higher education?

Another source of political complexity is the number of educators who are serving in the legislature. According to records furnished the Committee, sixteen members of the senate and house chambers also hold appointments in colleges and universities in the state. This includes three presidents of two-year colleges in the state. An additional 11 members of the senate and house hold appointment in the K-12 systems of the state. "Who Guards the Guardians?" would appear to be a phrase that fits Alabama well.

The Committee is aware that the Ethics Commission of the State has ruled that such dual service does not violate ethics provisions of the state. Even so, there are reasons to question this practice. If a college president, for example, can simultaneously serve his/her campus and serve the legislature, a reasonable question to pose is whether the presidency is a full time job or not. Second, the ruling of the Ethics Commission notwithstanding, the cause of public trust is not served well when educators participate in policy and law formation that affect their own welfare, an obvious conflict of interest.

The need for executive and legislative branches of government to insure both educational and fiscal accountability in higher education has been accented in a series of book length critiques of higher education that have appeared in recent

years, critiques that would include among others Allan Bloom's The Closing of the American Mind (1987), Charles Sykes's Profscam (1988), Page Smith's Killing the Spirit (1990), Martin Anderson's Impostors in the Temple (1992), and George Roche's The Fall of the Ivory Tower (1993). It is almost impossible to read a single week of the Chronicle of Higher Education, or indeed more general media reports such as USA Today and the weekly news magazines without reading there the disappointing record of college leaders betraying personal, professional, and public trust.

No one would argue, nor does the Committee suggest, that departures from standards of nobility and trust constitute the dominant reality in American colleges and universities—as there is a reality and a history of goodness represented in the quieter acts of faculty and administrators who honor their obligations and responsibilities with care and competence every day. What might be argued is that even one collegiate leader who abandons the call of honor, whose conscience betrays his or her competence, is one too many and that every departure from the call of honor damages the entire collegiate enterprise. Thus, from the perspective of appropriate accountability, there is much to commend the independence of public decision bodies such as legislatures from colleges and universities.

One other issue may be explored under this discussion on political complexity. The extensive two-year college system of 32 institutions is governed by an executive officer, a Chancellor, who reports to the State Board of Education, an elected board, that also has governance responsibility for elementary and secondary schools in the state. Having governance responsibility for the two-year college system tucked in with the elementary and secondary school system is a disadvantage in coordinating the interests of higher education. We will have more to say on this in the third section of this report, where we explore the Commission's role in developing a funding formula and making budget recommendations for colleges in the state.

II.

COMMISSION EFFECTIVENESS

BALANCING ADVOCACY AND ACCOUNTABILITY EXPECTATIONS

As we earlier noted, the Committee sought perspective on the performance of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education from a number of constituent groups in the state:

- Faculty and Administrators
- Board Members and Trustees.
- Legislators and Executive Branch Officers
- Civic Leaders

One instrument of the solicitation was the two-part questionnaire found in Appendix B. Of approximately 500 questionnaires sent out, a little under 100 were returned. As might be expected, most of the returns came from the first two groups above. Returns from legislators and civic leaders were extremely low. Thus, the survey results do not represent a statistically defensible opinion sampling of the above four groups. They may provide, however, an informing glimpse into perception and opinion, and it is to those data that we now turn.

EXPLORATIONS OF COMMISSION ROLE

The second part of the questionnaire was constructed from the law specifying the responsibilities of the Commission. Table V carries a summary of evaluations from the different referent groups. These results should be interpreted with care for the reasons already cited.

Some aspects of the profile, however, do warrant discussion. If we look at the referent group of faculty and administrators in colleges and universities, three areas of Commission responsibility occupy the lower end of opinion continuum and one the higher end. Based on perceptions of campus constituents, then, the Committee would conclude that additional attention might be warranted in . . .

- Developing and implementing a long range plan for postsecondary education

- Developing and recommending legislation to insure high quality education in the state

- Advising the governor, at his request, regarding postsecondary matters.

And the Committee underlines the accord given to the Commission's operation of student aid programs for the state.

The Commission did publish a long range plan in 1991, a plan that focused on four strategic goals for higher education and several objectives associated with each goal: Collaboration, Access, Quality Instruction, Research and Economic Development. Investing in Alabama's Future: State-Level Strategic Objectives for Higher Education indicates that "All of these planning activities were highly participatory activities which included much interaction with the institutions (p. 1.)." Given the existence of this plan and its statement of full participation, why this evaluation?

Development of a long range plan can be seen as an exercise in busy work, something to be endured, finished, and placed on the shelf. Or it can be seen as a critical instrument in developing an agenda of common goals and values, an instrument for the nurture of community, an instrument for the orchestration of consent and dissent, an instrument for building an integrated system of higher education. Without active and substantive participation of the entire higher education community, planning is less likely to result in the achievement of these important outcomes of both product and process. The Committee is not sure that long range planning in Alabama has reached its promise for uniting the system of higher education in common cause.

A plan without link to the budgeting process, for example, is likely to be both ignored and ineffective, as campus budgets are the most obvious operational expressions of priorities. Moreover, a plan that does not provide for benchmark reports on progress is also likely to be ignored and ineffective. The 1992-93 Annual Report furnished to the Committee offered no commentary on achievements or progress related to the 1991 Strategic Goals and Objectives, or at least that were overtly linked to that plan.

However, in Attachment D of materials furnished by the Commission to members of the Committee under title of "Responses to the Recommendations of the Fifth Quadrennial Evaluation Report" is a section described as "Institutional Initiatives to Support Goals in the State Plan." These materials were apparently a discussion item on the Commission's agenda for Friday, March 18, 1994.

TABLE V
EVALUATION OF COMMISSION RESPONSIBILITIES

	Faculty /Admin (N=30)	Trustees (N=9)	Legislators (N=14)	Civic/Media/ Business (N=15)	Other/ Unspecified (N=14)	Total (N=82)
Analyzing and evaluating present and future needs for instruction, research, and public service in postsecondary education	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.6	2.4
Developing and implementing a long range plan for postsecondary education	1.9	2.3	2.3	1.8	2.4	2.1
Establishing a university and college information system	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.4
Reviewing and approving/disapproving proposals for new programs or units of instruction	2.5	2.1	2.3	2.0	3.1	2.5
Reviewing and approving/disapproving proposals for off-campus offerings	2.4	1.8	2.3	1.5	2.9	2.4
Reviewing existing programs and units of instruction, research and service	2.2	2.0	2.5	1.8	2.2	2.2
Developing and presenting a unified budget to governor and legislature	2.3	3.0	2.8	2.4	3.0	2.6
Planning and conducting special studies, surveys, and evaluations related to postsecondary education	2.4	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.5
Developing and recommending legislation to insure high quality education in the state	1.8	1.4	2.2	1.8	2.1	1.9
Advising the governor, at his request, regarding postsecondary matters	2.0	2.2	2	2.4	2.9	2.2
Studying and making recommendations on public institution role and scope	2.0	1.4	2.6	1.9	2.6	2.1
Operating student aid programs for the state	3.04	1.6	3.2	2.6	3.5	3.0

Evaluation Scale - 4 = Highly effective
3 = Adequately effective
2 = Moderately effective
1 = Not effective

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Under the goals of Collaboration, Access, Quality Instruction, and Research and Economic Development, a range of support activities is reported for universities in the state. There is, however, not a single entry for any of the two-year colleges in the state. Can a plan supported only by the universities of the state be seen as comprehensive or long range in its impact? We will return to the issue of relationships with the two-year college sector in a discussion to follow.

The 1993-94 Annual Report of the Commission did contain five references to activities associated with the goals originally given in the 1991 Plan. However, there was no specific section devoted to a progress report on goals developed in that plan. Establishing activity and achievement indicators that allow some assessment on progress toward statewide goals for higher education is a more prevalent accountability policy now in many states.

A recent report of the Southern Regional Education Board indicates that Alabama is one of two states in the Southeast that does not have a state level performance indicator system in place, a profile of performance evidence that allows a state to garner some sense of the trend and health of its higher education system and its progress toward achievement of long range goals (Bogue, Creech, Folger, 1994). Tennessee, for example, requires its institutions to report annually on the following performance indicators:

- Number and percentage of accredited programs and programs eligible for accreditation
- Percentage of students accepted from those applying; percentage meeting admissions standards; average ACT scores of newly admitted students
- Number and percentage of students who complete their degree program
- Number of degrees awarded by discipline
- Percentage of lower division courses taught by full-time faculty, part time faculty, and graduate assistants
- Students in remedial courses, students exiting remedial courses and successfully completing entry-level courses
- African-American student enrollment; change over five years
- Pass rates and scores on professional licensure examinations

- Job placement rates of vocational program graduates

- Student transfer between two-year institutions and four-year institutions

- Alumni satisfaction

The state of South Carolina has a similar profile of performance indicators. No one would argue, nor does the Committee, that these indicators furnish a complete or adequate profile of higher education quality or performance. What might be advanced, however, is that a state having this kind of performance intelligence available over a long period of time can make more informed decisions about goals, policy, and financial support than a state having no information about how its system of higher education is performing. This commentary on issues related to higher education quality may be easily linked to the Commission's statutory role in ". . .recommending legislation to insure high quality. . . ."

It is not necessary, nor appropriate, for one state to look like another or to copy the policy actions of another state. On the other hand, there is no need to ignore good lessons that may be garnered from exploring the policy ventures of other states. As noted, in South Carolina and Tennessee, the coordinating commissions of both those states took policy and legislative initiative related to quality, performance indicators, and funding. Working with the entire Tennessee higher education community, campuses and their governing boards, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission gave birth to its performance funding policy almost fifteen years ago, and the "Cutting Edge" initiative for excellence in higher education was developed by the South Carolina Commission in 1988. The Virginia coordinating council has taken several initiatives in such areas as educational assessment, equipment trust funds, and competitive grant programs.

Two other areas of constituent concern that may be identified in the evaluation profile of Table VII are reviewing proposals for off-campus programs and making recommendations on institution role and scope. We will have more to say on both these issues in Section III.

ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPEDANCES

Part I of the questionnaire invited respondents to comment on these four questions:

- What is the most significant leadership/policy initiative undertaken by the Commission?

- What is the most significant leadership/policy issue still in need of attention by the Commission?

- What is the most significant impediment to the effectiveness of the Commission?

- What is the most important difference the Commission has made in the development and performance of Alabama postsecondary education?

A verbatim summary of responses received to these four questions may be found in Appendix E. Here we attempt a summary exploration. The reader is invited to test the representation of these summary reflections against his/her review of responses in Appendix E.

Leadership Initiative

The difficulty in attempting any analysis and evaluation of these open-ended perspectives is that the range of issues and evaluations is quite extraordinary. For example, in reviewing responses from civic leaders, media representatives and business leaders one can find these two contrasting evaluative comments, one affirming and one critical:

An Affirmation of Commission Performance: Attempt to present coordinated higher education budgets to the Legislature and have them accepted by both the legislators and the colleges . . .

and

A Concern with Commission Performance: My perception is that the Commission has not provided any significant leadership, initiative, vision, or direction.

The Committee's assessment of these open-ended responses to the questionnaire suggests that there are two or three leadership initiatives where the Commission enjoys affirmation of its leadership:

- Developing a unified budget recommendation

- Attempting to control course and program proliferation and duplication

- Taking steps to control off-campus offerings

Leadership Agenda and Opportunity

Not surprisingly, many of these areas in which Commission leadership was affirmed are also seen as policy issues still in need of attention. Relationships with the two-year college sector come in for frequent attention in terms of number of campuses and programs and the control of off-campus offerings.

Earlier, we commented on the difficulty of the Commission responding to both its advocacy and accountability role expectations. Here is a quote on an advocacy expectation of the Commission furnished by a campus representative:

> The most significant issue still in need of attention by the Commission is the need for a statewide public awareness effort which presents the needs for higher education and the benefits derived from a strong system of higher education in Alabama. While complying with its statutory mandate, the Commission could and must become a more outspoken advocate of higher education and present a positive case for higher education to the citizens of Alabama.

The Committee believes that it is possible, perhaps imperative, for the Commission to respond to this advocacy call, and simultaneously serve the call for accountability, by taking leadership initiatives in (1) strengthening community (developing a more integrated system), and (2) enhancing evidence of quality. Such initiatives would result in enhanced public trust and confidence, and we will have more to say on this in Section III.

Leadership Impediments

Views on those factors impeding the leadership of the Commission range in content from (1) limited and biased vision of Commission staff and members, (2) lack of Commission authority to do its work, to (3) complications arising from the political influence of campuses, especially from the two-year system.

The adversarial relationship perceived to exist between the Commission and the two-year college system receives special attention in these comments. We emphasize again, however, that no state will have an effective and high quality system of higher education if any institution or cluster of institutions is perceived as second class citizens. Nor will a state have an effective and high quality system of higher education if any institution or cluster of institutions lives at the level of mediocrity—accepting shoddy and shallow work and inviting the perception that it is a second class operation or one of questionable educational or management integrity.

Concerning the perceived lack of Commission authority, the Committee offers a friendly dissent with that perception. Previous evaluation committees have recommended that the Commission be given power to terminate academic programs—a recommendation of the Fifth Quadrennial Committee, for example. While some responding to the questionnaire viewed the Commission as a "toothless tiger," the Committee's view is that the Commission possesses a quite adequate bite. The Commission's lawsuit to block Central Alabama Community College from moving an off-campus program into a facility constructed by Millbrook Leasing is a lively example of the Commission "showing its teeth." The Committee is recommending additional Commission authority in facilities planning and funding recommendations.

Leadership Impact

Looking at the question of leadership effectiveness, Joseph Epstein wrote in his book Ambition (1980) of several standards of effectiveness: "There is the standard of the cash box. There is the standard of good works. There is the standard of public opinion. There is the standard of harmlessness, of doing little to make life poorer for one's fellows. There is the standard of altering history, of changing the life of one's time. There is the standard of being in some ineffable way, a force" (1980, p. 40).

Has the Commission changed the life of Alabama higher education? Has it been a "force" in the life of Alabama higher education? We may note that it has been enough of an influence and force that attitudes toward the Commission are anything but equivocal. One civic leader interviewed suggested that, contrary to conventional opinion, he would consider it a salute to Commission leadership if a bill were introduced each year in the legislature to abolish the Commission, as this would mean the Commission was doing something to disturb the status quo and to warrant public attention.

One of the more concise views of Commission impact is that the Commission has brought "order and restraint in two areas: off-campus offerings and new instructional programs." The Commission also comes in for salute in (1) causing campuses to plan more carefully and to identify priorities and values and (2) bringing a more unified, equitable, and objective approach to campus funding.

Immediately following these relatively favorable assessments, however, two respondents offered these comments:

> Have made no positive impact on performance and have been seen as more of a hindrance than a help in the development of the two-year college system.

• • •

> The Commission has been an impediment to postsecondary education in Alabama. The Commission has yet to recognize the community colleges as a significant catalyst to economic development in the state and insists upon a university model of program approval requiring a ten-month wait between program submission and program approval, completely out of touch with local economic needs.

Readers will find similar comments upon close review of the materials in Appendix E. The perceived friction between the Commission and the two-year college system continues to emerge as a theme in these responses to the questionnaire.

That this critical perception of Commission leadership impact is not without contrast may be seen in this assessment:

1) The Commission has created a climate of cooperation and harmony whereby institutions can interact with one another to develop the best policies and programs.

2) The diligence and dedication in developing a unified budget has been a benefit to reducing tensions and providing a comprehensive, collaborative budget presentation for higher education.

Clearly, there are multiple perspectives as one examines the impact of the Commission's leadership—an unsurprising finding when one looks at the complication of evaluating leadership from either an individual or organizational perspective.

INTERVIEW AND DOCUMENT REVIEW FINDINGS

Interviews were held in four major cities during the months of September and October of 1994, and the names/positions of those interviewed can be found in Appendix C. Exploring the outcomes of these interviews furnishes a useful connection between Sections II and III, as the Committee invited those interviewed to reflect not only on past performance of the Commission and the condition of Alabama higher education but to reflect also on possible changes that might contribute to enhanced effectiveness of the Commission and higher education in the state.

In addition to these interviews, the Committee members reviewed an extensive collection of documents related to Commission responsibility and work—special reports, statistical profiles, statutes, policy statements, minutes, budget recommendations, etc. The Committee did not record the interviews but did maintain notes on the interview exchanges. What we present here are Committee impressions of major themes that emerged in these interviews.

Relationships with Two-year College System

No theme seemed more ubiquitous in its frequency than the history, performance, and promise of the state's two-year college system—and relationships between the two-year college sector and the Commission. Any attempt to generalize the impressions of those interviewed who were not a part of the two-year college system is an exercise of high subjectivity, but a summary of those comments would include the following descriptors taken from interview notes. The two-year college system was seen as "out of control, overbuilt, highly politicized, a source of educational and political incest, the biggest Commission challenge, a system with questionable quality in some off-campus centers, a cluster of academic fiefdoms, and a system largely ungoverned by the State Board of Education."

From the perspective of those associated with the two-year college sector, the Commission was frequently characterized by these descriptors: "no appreciation of two-year college mission and role, completely insensitive to two-year college problems, program and financial policies not responsive to two-year colleges, two-year colleges have taken bum rap in Alabama for 30 years."

That the Commission and the two-year college sector have enjoyed what might be described as a tensioned relationship is affirmed by two policy actions. We previously mentioned the Court ruling in the Millbrook case in which the courts ruled that the Commission did have the authority to regulate off-campus offerings, thus denying Central Alabama Community College the establishment of an off-campus center in a leased facility that had already been built. In another action, however, the Commission's denial of a physical therapy program to Wallace Community College in Hanceville was overruled by legislative action.

One civic leader and former legislator interviewed offered an interesting and perhaps thoughtful perspective on Commission role and performance. He noted that he might worry if the Commission received two many good marks, because it might mean that the Commission was not doing its job in attempting to curb the proliferation of programs and campuses.

Another seasoned administrator noted that there was nothing wrong with Alabama higher education that a good depression would not solve, suggesting that such a depression might offer a good opportunity and excuse to cut back on both programs and campuses.

These comments notwithstanding, the Committee is concerned with the sharp and different perceptions concerning the two-year college system and relationships between the Commission and that system, and with the senior college system as well. Two-year technical and community colleges are a major American innovation in higher education. Two-year colleges have made notable contributions to the policy goal of enhancing access. Over the nation, more than 40% of entering freshmen are enrolled in two-year campuses. These campuses are also a major avenue of social and economic mobility, offering a second chance to many students and giving them an opportunity to demonstrate their promise by performance. Two-year campuses constitute important economic development instruments for their service regions, with their quick response training and educational programs. And they are an important source for retraining: skill development and enhancement.

On the economic development mission of higher education, members of the Committee offer this note. The Committee acknowledges the frequent reference from those interviewed concerning the importance of two-year colleges as instruments of local, regional, and state economic development. Indeed, America's entire higher education system is properly seen as the conceptual engine that drives the economic health of our nation. While respecting this mission of colleges and universities, it is important to keep in mind another mission which is carried in a passage from the British philosopher Bertrand Russell:

> Men who boast of being what is called "practical" are for the most part exclusively preoccupied with means. But theirs is only one-half of wisdom. When we take into account the other half, which is concerned with ends, the economic process and the whole of human life take on an entirely new aspect. We ask no longer: What have the producers produced and what has consumption enabled the consumers in their turn to produce? We ask instead: What has there been in the lives of the consumers and the producers to make them glad to be alive?

American colleges and universities are responsible for educating men and women beyond technical and professional proficiency, for educating men and women who will have more than one half of wisdom. Now back to the importance of two-year colleges and their role in a high quality system.

Most states properly and proudly consider their two-year college system a critical and central partner in the overall system of higher education. At the risk of pounding the nail too often and running the risk of breaking the board, we

emphasize again that there is no room in a truly excellent state system of higher education for second class citizens. Each institution and each system must be recognized for its unique mission and expression of quality. To achieve that recognition, however, each institution and each system must be seen as exemplars of both educational and management integrity.

Many of those interviewed felt that a new system of governance was needed for the two-year college system, and the Committee is inclined to agree. There are many options possible, but the Committee will recommend in Section III the separation of the two-year colleges from the State Department of Education and the creation of a separate governing board for the 32 two-year colleges, with members of this board appointed by the Governor. Separate governing boards for two-year colleges may be found in Florida, Virginia, and North Carolina.

State Policy on Capital Construction and Facilities

For the Committee, another outcome of the interviews was the discovery that the State of Alabama apparently has no system to control the planning and funding of facilities on its college campuses. Most states have a review process that would result in prioritized recommendations for both facility planning and construction appropriations. In many states the coordinating commission is given responsibility for maintaining a facilities data system on size, type/function, and age of square footage so that it can make both operating budget and capital budget recommendations to the Governor and legislature.

In Alabama, apparently a campus with a budget surplus or with bonding option can arrange for, construct, and/or lease a facility without state approval or oversight. The construction and lease of facilities therefore can proceed without state level assessment of need or impact on operational budgets of campuses.

Executive Director Confirmation Requirement

In the interviews, the Committee found almost no support for the continuance of the Senate Confirmation requirement for the Executive Director of the Commission but did hear from many who favored the abolishment of that requirement. We earlier explored the dysfunctional impact of this requirement, and we will offer a recommendation in Section III.

Commission Policy on Off-Campus Courses and Programs

While many of those interviewed saluted the Commission's initiative in reviewing off-campus programs, most felt that the Commission had chosen an awkward management strategy to achieve a worthwhile goal. According to information furnished the Committee, the Commission apparently reviewed some 2800 off-campus course requests during the last year. And according to the public remarks of the Commission's Executive Director, only 1,755 of these 2800 courses were actually offered (Montgomery Advertiser, October 25, 1994). Apparently, therefore, significant staff and Commission energy is being taken in reviewing courses that are never offered.

This approach to review and evaluation of off-campus offerings was seen by some as an example of Commission micromanagement of campuses. Once criteria have been developed for enrollment, staffing, and quality indicators of off-campus courses and programs, a simpler and more effective approach—and one within the Commission's statutory authority—would be for the staff to conduct spot audits of off-campus programs, with attendant budget and/or program sanctions for campuses that did not meet the established criteria. This, however, is just one possibility and there may be other more effective approaches. The Committee understands that the Commission staff is currently looking at this issue and will commend that initiative and a policy change in a recommendation of Section III.

The Committee offers two other observations on this issue. Many of those commenting on the increase in off-campus courses cited as unhappy examples courses offered by two-year colleges in shopping malls and in other commercial locations. Certainly there is a limit to what educational experiences can and should be offered in such off-campus locations, given the requirements of laboratories and other supportive learning services. However, it is important to note that two-year colleges are not the only colleges that offer courses in commercial locations. Indiana University-Purdue University in Indianapolis offers a program entitled Learn and Shop, which moved some courses from the main campus into the training rooms of major department stories in shopping malls. Among the advantages cited by students in those settings were convenience, comfort, and safety.

Other comments related to off-campus courses centered on the issue of quality, a legitimate concern. However, should a Commission concern for quality (e.g.,qualifications of faculty) and efficiency (e.g., enrollment and class size) for off-campus courses be different from courses offered on the campus? What argument can be made for the Commission examining the quality and efficiency of off-campus courses without equal concern for quality and efficiency of on-campus courses? Might it be argued that quality assurance is a responsibility to be first felt by the institution, its governing board, and appropriate accrediting agencies, regional and professional?

There is, however, an appropriate and important leadership role for the Commission to play in promoting the cause of quality and in encouraging campuses to be more public about the evidence for quality of their programs and services. To this responsibility we will return in Section III.

Budget and Formula Funding Responsibilities

One of the areas where the Commission is seen from two widely varying perspectives is budget and fiscal policy. Many of those interviewed perceived that one of the Commission's major strengths lay in the development of the Unified Budget Agreement which is the basis for operational budget recommendations made to the Governor and the Legislature each year. Indeed, for the most recent year, it would appear that legislative appropriations have been very supportive of Commission recommendations. Table VI summarizes data furnished to the Committee by the Commission. In 1994-95, for example, the legislative appropriation funded campuses at 99.1% of Commission recommendation.

Another way of looking at the Commission's recommendations, however, is to examine legislative appropriations as a percent of regional standard (how far Alabama is from the Southern Regional Educational Board standard). Table VII indicates a more sober figure of 69.9%, with an institutional range of 44.2% to 111.5%.

TABLE VI
Percent Of Commission Recommendation
Funded By ASETF Appropriation
Alabama Public Higher Education
1988-89 - 1994-95

Institution	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91 Prorated 6.5%	1991-92 Prorated 3.0%	1992-93*	1993-94*	1994-95*
AAM	109.4	102.5	92.6	98.5	96.0	96.4	104.0
AU	103.1	89.6	87.7	92.7	94.4	92.9	97.1
UA	103.1	91.3	87.7	93.9	94.4	93.2	97.3
UAB	103.2	91.0	87.6	98.9	94.5	92.9	97.0
UAH	103.1	90.6	87.6	92.6	96.2	91.2	96.8
UA SYSTEM	103.2	91.1	87.7	96.4	94.6	92.8	97.0
USA	103.1	91.2	87.6	99.4	94.4	93.4	97.0
Total Doctoral	103.4	91.1	87.9	95.7	94.6	93.1	97.4
ASU	109.5	103.1	95.2	99.7	98.1	99.8	105.1
ASC	107.8	81.7	95.1	90.4	94.4	90.3	95.2
AUM	103.1	91.5	87.6	94.2	94.6	92.7	96.2
JSU	103.1	91.6	87.6	97.1	94.4	93.2	97.1
LU	103.1	94.8	87.6	98.0	94.4	94.6	102.4
TSU	102.2	90.2	87.6	95.6	94.4	93.4	97.0
TSUD	103.1	78.7	87.6	90.8	94.4	91.0	100.0
TSUM	108.3	82.8	87.6	90.2	94.4	81.8	101.7
TSU SYSTEM	103.1	87.7	87.6	94.1	94.4	91.2	98.2
UM	103.1	95.2	87.6	97.0	94.4	93.7	98.1
UNA	103.1	91.9	87.6	96.0	94.4	95.0	98.2
Total Nondoc	104.3	92.9	89.2	96.2	95.1	94.1	99.0
Total 4 Yr	103.6	91.4	88.1	95.8	94.7	93.3	97.7
Two-Yr System	100.8	90.1	88.4	94.4	94.8	97.2	104.5
TOTAL	**103.0**	**91.2**	**88.2**	**95.5**	**94.7**	**94.0**	**99.1**

*Includes FICA

TABLE VII
Percent Of Regional Standard
Funded By ASETF Appropriation
Alabama Public Higher Education
1988-89 - 1994-95

Institution	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91 Prorated 6.5%	1991-92 Prorated 3.0%	1992-93*	1993-94*	1994-95*
AAM	119.6	115.3	99.5	87.9	75.6	77.1	83.6
AU	85.3	80.3	75.2	67.6	58.6	60.7	65.7
UA	90.1	82.7	77.3	69.9	61.0	62.8	68.6
UAB	90.9	81.2	76.2	73.7	61.8	61.9	63.7
UAH	93.2	80.7	73.2	64.1	56.7	56.1	61.9
UA SYSTEM	90.8	81.7	76.2	71.2	60.9	61.5	65.1
USA	89.1	82.3	75.1	75.1	63.6	63.5	63.2
Total Doctoral	89.9	82.4	76.6	71.1	61.0	62.0	65.7
ASU	162.7	151.9	150.5	139.0	122.2	109.7	111.5
ASC	89.9	69.5	73.2	58.6	45.3	43.4	45.7
AUM	92.5	84.7	79.4	72.3	63.8	60.5	64.6
JSU	92.7	85.1	79.8	73.3	61.1	62.9	66.2
LU	105.8	99.6	89.3	83.3	70.7	68.7	72.1
TSU	91.0	82.2	80.8	74.1	63.3	63.9	65.8
TSUD	83.9	69.8	67.1	62.4	47.1	45.1	46.9
TSUM	75.9	67.2	65.3	58.0	44.4	39.8	44.2
TSU SYSTEM	87.8	78.2	76.1	69.5	57.1	55.9	57.7
UM	97.5	104.2	92.9	80.0	68.3	64.8	70.1
UNA	94.8	87.7	84.0	78.1	67.6	70.5	75.8
Total Nondoc	100.7	93.0	88.1	79.8	67.6	66.2	69.6
Total 4 Yr	91.9	84.3	78.6	72.7	62.2	62.8	66.5
Two-Yr System	85.6	83.0	72.8	72.1	62.4	68.6	86.5
TOTAL	**90.8**	**84.1**	**77.4**	**72.6**	**62.3**	**63.9**	**69.9**

*Includes FICA

What is seen as a Commission strength is also seen as an area of needed improvement on at least two counts. The Commission is currently using a "base plus" method of funding, which, according to the Committee's understanding, guarantees an institution its previous year's base—regardless of enrollment fluctuation—and then recommends appropriations beyond the base on a formula approach. The effect of this approach is to distract from bringing all institutions closer to the SREB average on an equitable basis. Why, for example, would Troy State University Montgomery be happy with 44.2% of the SREB average while Alabama State University is funded at 111.5% of the SREB average? There are complex histories in the answer to this question. The Commission staff is aware of this difficulty, however, and is working on that equity issue.

A more problematic issue turns on the Commission's funding recommendations for the two-year college system. Many of those interviewed suggested that the legislature was essentially operating its own formula and allocation system for the two-year college system and ignoring the Commission's recommendations. Note in Table VII and the earlier presented Table II that the two-year college sector is receiving relatively favorable treatment vis-a-vis the Commission's recommendations.

We believe that the Commission may have invited this condition by failing to follow the requirement of its own law. Section 16-5-9, paragraph (b) says that:

> The Commission shall receive, evaluate, and coordinate budget requests for the public institutions of higher education of this State, shall hold open hearings on the budget requests of the separate institutions and shall present to each institution and to the governor and the legislature, a single unified budget report containing budget recommendations for separate appropriations to each of the institutions.

The Commission is not making "separate" budget recommendations for two-year campuses. Instead, the Commission is making a global recommendation for the entire two-year college system. There are several unfortunate effects of this policy. First, the Commission is in violation of its own law. Second, the current approach invites the perception that the Commission is concerned with equity differences among four-year campuses, but not among two-year campuses, a point made by several two-year presidents interviewed. Third, this approach represents an inconsistency in treatment of two-year and senior college campuses. For example, there are three multi-campus systems among the senior colleges (University of Alabama system, Auburn University System, and Troy State University System), but the Commission does not make global budget

recommendations for these three systems. Fourth, by failing to follow its own law, the Commission invites legislative initiative that complicates its own work. Fifth, by ignoring equity issues in the two-year college sector, the Commission invites the possible enmity of the four-year institutions. Finally, by failing to follow its own law, the Commission encourages the perception that it is a "paper tiger" or "toothless tiger" or "a political patsy"—all terms taken from feedback of those surveyed and conversation of those interviewed. The Committee will offer a recommendation on this policy issue in Section III.

The Committee observes in passing that it is not apparent that the Chancellor/executive staff of the two-year colleges and members of the State Board of Education are paying very careful governance attention to funding equity issues on its own campuses, since there appear to be wide variances in funding equity and funding balances. The Committee was told that at least one campus was carrying a reserve equivalent to 30% of its current operating budget—a fiscal position which 99% of college presidents over the country would view with unabashed envy. With current funding, apparently some campuses have been able to develop very large reserves, which they then use for such items as capital construction, while other campuses are left struggling with little or no reserves at the end of the year. This would particularly be the case in those years in which prorations left campuses to meet salary obligations, even as budgets were reduced during the year. It would appear that the current legislative approach to funding the two-year colleges encourages inefficiencies by allocating large base support to small campuses, even after some of these were supposedly merged with another campus.

In summary, there can be no partnership where one of the partners is weak and the other strong. Certainly, one of the steps that can be taken to accord the two-year college system appropriate regard is to assure that it is treated as a full and contributing partner, recognizing the important role that the two-year system plays and avoiding peck-order perceptions of quality. Another way is to insist that the two-year college system play by the same rules as the other partners. This means having the Commission develop a budget and formula policy that meets the requirement of the law—a separate budget recommendation for each institution—and insisting that the Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education and the two-year institutions respond to that provision of law as well.

As a passing note, members of the Committee found it curious that the Commission apparently does not maintain on file current operating budgets of campuses in the state. Since an operating budget is such a fundamental expression of an institution's educational goals and financial stewardship and

carries such important information about the operation of a campus, we would have expected that the Commission would have a current file of campus operating budgets. The maintenance of current information in both hard copy format and computer based format leads to our next discussion.

Maintaining a State Information System

Section 16-5-7, paragraph (a) states that ". . .The Commission, after affording a full opportunity to the public institutions of higher education to be heard, shall design and establish a State University and College Information System to provide comprehensive, meaningful, and timely information pertinent to the formulation of decisions and recommendations by the Commission." From its review of documents and interviews with Commission staff, and with all others interviewed, the Committee was not able to discern that this element of the Commission's statutory role was being discharged. The Committee finds that the failure to establish such an information system is a regrettable leadership posture for several reasons.

To create a workable formula and to make meaningful policy decisions and recommendations on campus budgets, for example, requires accurate data on enrollments by program level and type, data that allow an audit to certify the accuracy of campus records. In the late 1970s, the state auditor of Tennessee discovered that one of the state's colleges had enrolled on its campus over 1,000 students who were academically ineligible according to its own academic policies. This campus had been drawing formula and budget support for several years that was not justified by its "legal" enrollment.

Understandably concerned about this departure in campus academic and financial integrity, a legislative committee asked the Tennessee Higher Education Commission to perform an enrollment audit of all remaining campuses. This audit was made possible by the Commission staff drawing student samples for each institution from the statewide enrollment reporting system. No other major enrollment errors were found on remaining campuses. As a note in passing, the Committee was not able to discern that any state agency in Alabama was conducting an audit of campus enrollments—a government management practice of serious neglect.

Studies of retention and transfer are difficult, if not impossible, without an enrollment data system, in automated format, available to the Commission. And the maintenance of an enrollment information system is central to the review of off-campus enrollments and programs.

It is difficult to ascertain why the Commission is over a quarter century into its life and responsibilities without having met this statutory responsibility. The answer certainly cannot be one of practical feasibility, since most other state coordinating agencies do maintain extensive and integrated information systems on enrollments, facilities, and finance. The development of a state level information system is in the best interest of all campuses, since the ability to document trends in activity and achievement should promote the principles of resource equity and public trust, both essential to a high quality community of higher education.

ON THE OTHER HAND . . .

There is a story told of former President Harry Truman that he yearned to be advised by one-armed economists so that they could never say "On the other hand . . . ." Having suggested several issues and leadership challenges of critical import, the Committee would be remiss if it did not report the many compliments accorded the Commission, its staff, and its Executive Director. Some felt that the Commission's action had avoided "chaos" in higher education, that the Commission was becoming a more assertive and a more astute player on the higher education scene—earning increased regard from both campus officers and legislative/executive officers.

These achievements and perceptions will be all the more notable, given the context we cited in Section I. This affirming note leads to our final comments, where we will open by affirming leadership on the part of the Commission as a major hope for enhancing both the efficiency and the effectiveness of Alabama higher education and then recommending an agenda for action.

III.

AFFIRMATION AND ACTION

A LEADERSHIP AGENDA

AFFIRMATION - AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PERFORMANCE RECORD

In what might be considered one of the more politically and educationally complex state climates in which to serve, the Alabama Commission on Higher Education is due recognition on several counts. The Commission is recognized by educational, civic, and political leaders for its attempt to bring additional clarity and equity in the unified budget recommendation. The Commission is widely perceived as trying to effectively balance concerns for campuses while asserting its own independence. The court resolution of the Millbrook leasing case is seen as an evidence of the Commission's more aggressive stance in trying to bring some order to what is perceived as a proliferation of off-campus courses and centers.

No one questioned the effectiveness of the Commission in operating an extensive statewide financial aid program, though recent changes in federal programs promise a dramatic change in the administration of loan programs and could result in significant downsizing of program and staff in this area. The Commission has been designated as the State Postsecondary Review Entity for Alabama. Though guidelines for operation of the SPRE have been developed, the operation of the SPRE has just begun and thus it is premature to evaluate the Commission's responsibility in this role.

Finally, the Commission drew recognition for its operation of special programs such as the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) and the Network of Alabama Academic Libraries.

The Committee believes that the Commission is discharging its responsibilities in a commendable fashion, given the complexity of the context in which it must work. The Committee further believes that the Commission has begun in recent actions to become appropriately assertive in its responsibilities. The Committee concludes, however, that the Commission has yet to realize the leadership promise that resides in its current pattern of authority and responsibility and that a more imaginative and aggressive use of its existing authority can work to the improvement of both efficiency and quality in Alabama higher education.

The recommendations to follow are divided in two parts—those intended for Commission attention and those directed to political and civic/corporate leaders of the state. We hope that the basis for these recommendations will be apparent in previous discussions.

AN ACTION AGENDA FOR THE COMMISSION

RECOMMENDATION ONE - That the Commission exert leadership to strengthen the sense of community in Alabama higher education, to promote a more effective "system" view and operation of Alabama Higher Education—a system in which each campus partner

- is respected for its unique contribution to the state and its citizens,
- is held responsible for both educational and financial stewardship and integrity,
- is intimately involved in the construction and implementation of a statewide long range plan for higher education,
- is treated with equity by financial and budgeting policies, and
- is expected to offer public evidence on the quality and effectiveness of its performance.

RECOMMENDATION TWO - That the Commission revise its approach to formula funding and budgeting so that the policy and process (a) moves each campus in the state toward the same percentage of equity funding on SREB standards, (b) includes budget recommendations for each institution in the state in the unified budget recommendation—including each two-year institution as specified and required in the law establishing the Commission, and (c) arranges for an equitable consideration of both instate and out-of-state fee structures for each institution.

RECOMMENDATION THREE - That the Commission develop the higher education information system that is specified in its law so that it will have an appropriate data base for long range planning, for enrollment studies and audits, for monitoring off-campus activities, for maintaining activity and performance intelligence on the "Condition of Higher Education in Alabama," and for conducting other special studies that may be required within its statutes.

RECOMMENDATION FOUR - That the Commission revise its policy and practice in reviewing and evaluating off-campus programs/courses so that review guidelines and policies

- allow quick response to need;
- establish appropriate quality in staffing, support,and facilities;
- encourage effective stewardship of financial resources;
- minimize unnecessary paperwork and micromanagement tendencies;
- place campuses on a performance expectation via possible spot audits;
- indicate consequences when a campus is found in violation of off-campus policy following a performance audit.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE - That the Commission take a more aggressive stance in promoting the nurture and demonstration of quality among all campuses in the State by

- Working with the systems and campuses in conducting a study of differential admissions standards for campuses of different missions;
- Developing a policy that calls for campuses to develop a cluster of performance indicators that would offer public evidence on quality as related to that campus's mission;
- Establishing a cluster of statewide performance indicators that could be linked to the assessment of progress on statewide goals for higher education.

RECOMMENDATION SIX - That the Commission establish a moratorium on the expansion of existing campus missions to new degree levels, and the acquisition/creation of new campuses until the Commission, governing boards, and campuses have constructed a Master Plan whose goals and value commitments are endorsed and supported by the entire higher education community.

AN ACTION AGENDA FOR POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

RECOMMENDATION SEVEN - That the current statutory requirement mandating Senate confirmation of the Executive Director of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education be eliminated.

RECOMMENDATION EIGHT - That the governance of the two-year college system in Alabama be invested in a newly created Board for Two-year Colleges, with appointment of board members by the Governor.

RECOMMENDATION NINE - That the state adopt legislation to promote long range facility planning, lease, acquisition, and/or construction.

RECOMMENDATION TEN - That the Governor of the State take leadership in working with legislative and educational leaders in fashioning a resolution of the Title VI suit and submitting a proposed resolution to the court that will be endorsed by the Alabama Commission and all of higher education in the state.

APPENDIX A

SIXTH QUADRENNIAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

MEMBERSHIP, POSITION, ADDRESSES

SIXTH QUADRENNIAL EVALUATION
COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. E. Grady Bogue, Professor
Leadership Studies in Education
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996
(Chair of the Committee)

Chancellor Emeritus
Louisiana State University
in Shreveport
Shreveport, La 71115

Dr. Marilyn Clark Beck, President
Lord Fairfax Community College
Middletown, VA 22654

Mr. Paul Davis, Publisher
The Auburn Bulletin/Eagle
P. O. Box 3240
Auburn, AL 36830

Mr. Sabert Oglesby
1348 Panorama Drive
Birmingham, AL 35216

President Emeritus
Southern Research Institute
Birmingham, AL 35255

Mr. Fred Sheheen
Commissioner of Higher Education
South Carolina Commission
on Higher Education
1333 Main Street, Suite 200
Columbia, SC 29201

Dr. Walter Washington
6017 Woodlea Road
Jackson, MS 39206

President Emeritus
Alcorn State University
Lorman, MS 39090

APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee Survey
Alabama Commission on Higher Education

I. Your Position

- ☐ Faculty/administrator in college or university
- ☐ Member of campus or system board of trustees
- ☐ Member of state legislature
- ☐ Civic, media, business leader
- ☐ Other (identify if you desire)

_____

Please complete front and back of survey

II. General Questions on Role and Effectiveness of the Commission

(If you have no opinion on the question or no opportunity to develop an opinion, please check that option with each question.)

A. What is the most significant leadership/policy initiative undertaken by the Commission?

☐ No opportunity to observe or no opinion

B. What is the most significant leadership/policy issue still in need of attention by the Commission?

☐ No opportunity to observe or no opinion

C. What is the most significant impediment to the effectiveness of the work of the Commission?

☐ No opportunity to observe or no opinion

D. What is the most important difference the Commission has made in the development and performance of Alabama Postsecondary Education?

☐ No opportunity to observe or no opinion

(continued on back)

III. Evaluation of Commission Responsibilities

Using the response categories and scale provided, please indicate your assessment of Commission effectiveness in each of the statutory responsibilities specified below.

4 - Highly Effective
3 - Adequately Effective
2 - Moderately Effective
1 - Not Effective
NO - Not observed or no opinion

		NO	1	2	3	4
(1)	Analyzing and evaluating present and future needs for instruction, research, and public service in postsecondary education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(2)	Developing and implementing a long range plan for postsecondary education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(3)	Establishing a university and college information system	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(4)	Reviewing and approving/disapproving proposals for new programs or units of instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(5)	Reviewing and approving/disapproving proposals for off-campus offerings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(6)	Reviewing existing programs and units of instruction, research and service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(7)	Developing and presenting a unified budget to to governor and legislature	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(8)	Planning and conducting special studies, surveys, and evaluations related to postsecondary education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(9)	Developing and recommending legislation to insure high quality education in the state	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(10)	Advising the governor, at his request, regarding postsecondary matters	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(11)	Studying and making recommendations on public institution role and scope	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(12)	Operating student aid programs for the state	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

APPENDIX C

LIST OF THOSE INTERVIEWED BY

EVALUATION COMMITTEE

LIST OF THOSE INTERVIEWED BY THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Interviews were conducted in September and October 1994 in Birmingham, Huntsville, Montgomery, and Mobile.

Representatives of Higher Education Institutions

Dr. Philip Austin
Chancellor, University of Alabama System
Dr. James C. Bailey
President, Wallace State Community College-Hanceville
Dr. Glenna G. Brown
Assistant Vice President for Planning, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Dr. Raymond V. Chisum
President, MacArthur State Technical College
Dr. James H. Cornell
President, Central Alabama Community College
Dr. Victor B. Ficker
President, Gadsden State Community College
Dr. Fred Gainous
Chancellor, Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education
Dr. Johnny L. Harris
President, Drake State Technical College
Mr. James Harvey
President, Council for the Advancement of Private Colleges in Alabama
Dr. John A. Johnson
President, Alabama Southern Community College
Mr. Roy Johnson
President, Southern Union State Community College
Dr. John Lyons
Vice President for Planning and Information Management, University of Alabama at Birmingham
Dr. Robert McChesney
President, University of Montevallo
Chair, The Council of College and University Presidents
Dr. Thad McClammy
President, Trenholm State Technical College
Dr. Harold McGee
President, Jacksonville State University
Dr. Judy Merritt
President, Jefferson State Community College
Mr. Gordon Moulton
Vice President of Services and Planning, University of South Alabama
Dr. Paul Parks
Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Auburn University

Representatives of Higher Education Institutions (Continued):

Dr. Douglas C. Patterson
Vice Chancellor, Troy State University
Dr. Angela Roling
Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness,
Troy State University
Dr. Roger Sayers
President, University of Alabama
Mr. Alfred Yeager
Director of Institutional Research, University of South Alabama
Dr. Linda Young
President, Sparks State Technical College

Business, Education, and Civic Leaders

Hon. Albert Brewer
President, Public Affairs Research Council of Alabama
Former Governor of Alabama
Dr. Paul Hubbert
Executive Secretary, Alabama Education Association
Mr. James Jacobson
Editor, The Birmingham News
Ms. Jane Burke McDonald
Former Member and Chair, Commission on Higher Education
Mr. Chris McNair
Chair, Board of Trustees, Alabama A&M University
Dr. James Martin
Former President, Auburn University
Ms. Shirley Milligan
Blount, Incorporated
Dr. R.D. Morrison
Former President, Alabama A&M University
Dr. John Porter
Former Executive Director, Commission on Higher Education
Dr. Joe Reed
Chair, Board of Trustees, Alabama State University
Mr. Simuel Sippial, Jr.
Retired, IBM
Chair, Subcommittee on Health Professions Education
State of Alabama Health Care Reform Task Force
Mr. Sherman Suitts
Vulcan Materials
Dr. Joseph Sutton
Former Executive Director, Commission on Higher Education
Dr. Wayne Teague
State Superintendent of Schools

Governor's Office

Mr. Charles Waldrep
Chief of Staff for Governor Folsom
Ms. Debbie Smith
Education Liaison for Governor Folsom

Legislators and Legislative Staff

Hon. Chip Bailey
Senator, Dothan
Hon. Lowell Barron
Senator, Fyffe
Hon. Tom Butler
Representative, Huntsville
Hon. Pete Turnham
Representative, Auburn

Legislative Fiscal Office:
Mr. Frank Gitschier
Mr. Gene Murphree
Mr. Victor Vernon
Ms. Sandra Woodley

Commission Members Interviewed

Ms. Gaynell K. Dixon
Montgomery
Mr. Fred D. Lee, Jr., Chair (beginning October 1994)
Florence
Ms. Jane McPherson
Oneonta
Mr. Charles Morris
Selma
Mr. Borden Morrow, Past Chair (ending October 1994)
Daphne
Mr. Frank A. Nix
Birmingham
Ms. Cindy B. Paler
Decatur
Mr. Richard A. Pizitz
Birmingham
Mr. William L. Roberts, Jr.
Mobile
Mr. Charles R. Sittason
Tuscaloosa

Commission Staff Interviewed

Dr. Henry J. Hector
Executive Director
Dr. William O. Blow
Deputy Executive Director, Planning and Coordination
Mr. Thomas Roberson
Deputy Executive Director, Student Assistance
Ms. Brenda T. Carter
Director, Programs
Dr. Kitty C. Collier
Director, Planning
Ms. Kay Ivey
Director, Government Relations and Communication
Dr. Paul Mohr
Director, Special Programs
Dr. James Pate
Director, State Postsecondary Review Entity (SPRE)
Mr. Edward P. Rutledge
Director, Financial Affairs
Dr. William Wall
Director, Grants and Scholarships
Ms. Ellen E. Haulman
Assistant Director, Planning
Staff Liaison to the Evaluation Committee
Mr. Timothy W. Vick
Assistant Director, Programs

APPENDIX D

A CHRONOLOGY OF THE KNIGHT V. ALABAMA CASE

A CHRONOLOGY OF THE KNIGHT V. ALABAMA CASE

1978 This case originated from a Title VI compliance investigation of Alabama's public higher education by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (now the Department of Education).

1981 Governor Fob James and presidents of the public institutions received letters from the Department of Education stipulating that vestiges of the former de jure system allegedly remained in Alabama's public institutions of higher education in violation of Title VI. The state was directed to submit a plan to assure future compliance with Title VI. Nineteen other states were required to prepare similar plans.

After months of unsuccessful negotiations between the Governor's representative and representatives of OCR, the Assistant Secretary for OCR sent a "ten-day letter" to the Governor stating if within ten days Alabama did not submit a plan to eliminate the alleged vestiges of the dual system of higher education, the matter would be referred to the Justice Department for litigation. No plan was submitted.

The Knight plaintiffs filed suit, alleging that the desegregation of ASU was impeded by duplicative educational programming at ASU and TSUM, in violation of Title VI and the Fourteenth Amendment. However, the District Court granted a motion to the Governor and ACHE to stay all further action in Knight v. James pending resolution of Title VI administrative proceedings between the state of Alabama and the U. S. Department of Education. There was no resolution of the administrative proceedings.

1982 The stay was dissolved when the District Court was informed that the Department of Education had referred the Title VI enforcement proceedings to the Department of Justice.

The Middle District Court certified a plaintiff class consisting of graduates of ASU and African American citizens of Alabama who were eligible for employment by or who attended or may attend public institutions of higher education in the Montgomery area.

1983 The Justice Department filed its own lawsuit (U.S. v. Alabama), alleging that the defendants were maintaining vestiges of de jure segregation throughout its system of higher education. The District Court granted the motion of Knight, et al., to intervene in U.S. v. Alabama, on the grounds that its outcome would be determinative of the issues in Knight v. James.

1984 The Court certified the Knight intervenors to represent essentially the same Montgomery-related class the Middle District had certified. The Middle District Court stayed all further proceedings in Knight v. James (which later became Knight v. Wallace) "until a final judgement or order is reached in U.S. v. Alabama."

1985 Judge U. W. Clemon, the first of seven judges assigned the case, presided during the first trial which began on July 1, 1985, and concluded on August 2, 1985. On December 9, 1985, he ruled that the state had failed to dismantle the vestiges of the prior de jure dual system. He then ordered the "State of Alabama, (the Governor, ACHE and APSCA)" to submit a plan to eliminate all vestiges of the dual system of higher education. However, he approved consent decrees between the United States and the following institutions: Jacksonville State University; Livingston University; the University of South Alabama; and the University of Montevallo. The consent decrees require university commitment for Black representation relative to:

a. Governance
b. Student access, admissions and retention
c. Equal employment opportunity.

The United States considered the consent decrees to dispose of all claims which it made against these institutions.

1986 AU and the UA system filed a motion with the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals to stay the Clemon ruling. The stay was granted.

1987 The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals reversed and remanded Clemon's ruling. It held that the complaint of the United States should be dismissed without prejudice; the Knight Plaintiffs' Title VI claim should also be dismissed without prejudice; Judge Clemon should be removed from the case; and a new trial should be conducted if the Justice Department and the Knight Plaintiffs refile their claims. The Court of Appeals affirmed the Knight Plaintiffs' right to challenge vestiges of segregation under the Fourteenth Amendment. On remand, Knight, et al, were designated lead plaintiffs. The Knight Plaintiffs and the United States filed amended complaints.

1988 The Justice Department submitted to Governor Hunt a proposed consent decree and recommended that he and his staff review it and plan for a meeting to discuss the settlement. However, the suit continued due to lack of a settlement.

1989 After six other judges were recused on their own motion or by order of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, the Court assigned Judge Harold Murphy of Rome, Georgia, to the case. He reaffirmed the consent decrees for Jacksonville State University, Livingston University, the University of Montevallo, and the University of South Alabama.

1990 Judge Murphy disposed of all pending motions to dismiss the statewide Title VI claims of the United States and the Knight Plaintiffs. He also approved two consent decrees. One was between the United States and the State Board of Education, Athens State College and Calhoun State Community College. The other consent decree was between the United States and Troy State University-Montgomery.

The trial began on October 29, 1990 and was concluded on April 16, 1991.

1991 On December 30, 1991, Judge Harold Murphy ruled that there were vestiges of discrimination in higher education and ordered the following:

1. Faculty Employment

The Court expects to see material improvement in the employment of Black faculty at the following institutions in three years:

a. Auburn University
b. The University of Montevallo
c. Livingston University
d. Troy State University
e. Calhoun State Community College

2. Administrative Employment

The Court expects to see material improvement in the employment of Black Administrators at:

a. Auburn University
b. Calhoun State Community College
c. Jacksonville State University
d. Troy State University
e. The University of Alabama
f. The University of Alabama in Huntsville
g. The University of North Alabama

3. State Funding for Higher Education

The Alabama Commission on Higher Education shall modify its funding formula in the following fashion:

a. No more than the rate charged by ASU and AAMU, respectively, shall be applied to the average of the un-weighted on-campus semester credit hours (except military science) to obtain the amount of tuition and fee revenue to be deducted pursuant to the funding formula at Alabama State University and Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University.

b. The weighting factors in the academic subdivision groupings shall have an undergraduate weight of two (2) in the complexity indices utilized in its proposed funding budget for remedial courses on the undergraduate level. A remedial course is one defined as such by the institution.

4. Facilities

The Governor of Alabama and the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, and the Alabama Public School and College Authority shall, consistent with the Court's findings of fact, eliminate all vestiges of discrimination remaining in the facilities at Alabama State University and Alabama A&M University.

a. Alabama A&M should receive $10,628,306.
b. Alabama State should receive at least $9,873,078.

5. Admissions Policies

The Court directs Auburn University to review and modify its current undergraduate admissions policy which will be in place by 1993-94. The policy is to be one which, in good faith, Auburn believes will not have, and in fact does not have a disproportionate impact on Black applicants.

6. Program Duplication

a. The Court is to receive recommendations from the Consent Decree Committee regarding the elimination of unnecessary program duplication in the area of business between Alabama A&M and Calhoun State Community College's satellite campus in Huntsville.

b. A newly established Committee on Cooperation is to focus on the duplication existing between Alabama State University and Auburn University at Montgomery in the areas of business and education. The Committee is to recommend to the Court the establishment of cooperative programs in these two areas with a view toward substantially reducing program duplication in the schools of business and education.

c. Alabama A&M University shall have preference for any new teacher education programs established in the Huntsville area.

d. The Alabama Commission on Higher Education shall give Alabama State University and Alabama A&M University preference in the establishment of new high demand programs in the Montgomery and Huntsville areas.

e. Before final approval of any new academic program in either the Huntsville or Montgomery area, ACHE shall notify the Court and furnish it with sufficient information so that the Court can satisfy itself that the program does not unnecessarily duplicate programs already in place at ASU or AAMU, or impede the segregation of ASU and AAMU.

7. Alabama Code Section 16-50-20(a)

For the reasons set forth in the Court's conclusion of law the following language from the Alabama Code is stricken as unconstitutional: "At least one-half of the (ASU) board shall be of the prevailing minority population of the state."

8. Recruitment of White students at Alabama State University

ASU must develop and implement a plan to recruit white students to its campus. The Court expects to see material improvement in ASU's white student enrollment within three years.

9. Previously Executed Consent Decrees

These consent decrees are extended to include the same period of time as the Decree entered this day by the Court. (See #11).

10. Monitoring Committee and Yearly Reporting

The Court established a statewide Monitoring Committee to make annual reports to the court concerning compliance with the requirements of the Remedial Decree. The Committee also shall make reports concerning the following matters for all defendant universities and colleges involved in the litigation, including those previously entering into consent decrees with the United States:

a. Racial composition of the student body.
b. Racial composition of the faculty and administration.
c. Minority faculty and administrator recruitment.
d. Annual state appropriations.
e. Changes in admissions policies.
f. Changes in tenure requirements.
g. Changes in the ACHE formula.
h. Minority student recruitment and retention at the undergraduate, graduate and professional level.
i. New appointments to boards of trustees and the Alabama State Board of Education.
j. Establishment of cooperative programs between institutions.
k. New facilities construction

The Monitoring Committee is comprised of the already existing Council of Presidents. For purposes of making the annual report, this group is augmented by the Governor's representative, ACHE's Executive Director, and the Chancellor of the Department of Postsecondary Education in his capacity as director of Athens State College and State Community Colleges.

11. Time Limitation for Objections to Reports

a. Defendants that have been called upon to provide the Court with initial written reports must serve copies of the same to all parties. Any objections to the reports shall be filed within 30 days following receipt.

b. All annual reports to the Court under terms of the Decree shall be served on all parties of record. Objections to the annual reports shall be filed within 30 days following receipt.

12. Jurisdiction and Term of the Remedial Consent Decree

a. The Decree became effective December 30, 1991 and shall remain effective until July 31, 2002.

b. The Court specifically reserves the authority to direct the transfer of funds or payment thereof to and between any party or parties to this case in order to effectuate the Decree, so long as such action by the Court comports with the Constitution of the United States.

c. On July 31, 2002, the Decree shall terminate automatically and without further formality unless a party to the litigation, by motion filed not less than 60 days preceding the expiration date of the Decree, requests the Court to extend the term of the Decree.

d. The Court may extend the term of the Decree by entering an appropriate order if it deems that additional time is required to assure compliance and fully accomplish the Decree's objectives. The Court may also, at any time, modify or amend the terms and conditions of the Decree as needed to guarantee the elimination of any remaining vestiges of discrimination within Alabama's system and units of public higher education.

13. Attorneys' Fees

a. The Knight and Sims Plaintiffs are prevailing parties for purposes of an award of their attorney's fees and expenses with respect to all issues and stages of the litigation, including the parallel action in Knight v. James.

b. The Court ordered the parties to attempt to reach an agreement as to the amount of attorneys' fees and expenses. Since they did not, he has permitted the Plaintiffs' attorneys to file a motion for determination of the fees and expenses.

1992 Following are the major actions regarding the Remedial Decree:

1. Appeals

   a. The Knight Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs-intervenors appealed to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, indicating that the Court refused to grant the following injunctive relief the Plaintiffs requested:

      1) Elimination of all vestiges of segregation in the faculties, administrations, curricula and environments of the historically white universities.

      2) A complete remedy for the harm Black citizens suffer caused by the racially discriminatory restriction of the missions of the historically Black universities.

      3) A complete remedy for discrimination against Black citizens with respect to land grant programming and funding, including a requirement that the State of Alabama operate Alabama A&M as a full-fledged land grant university, with equitable shares of all state and federal land grant appropriations, thus enabling it to carry out its land grant mission and to become fully desegregated.

   b. The Alabama A&M Board of Trustees filed a similar appeal for the following reasons:

      1) The $10.8 million facilities improvement funds ordered by the Court is inadequate.

      2) Mission - Same as #2 in the Knight appeal.

      3) Land Grant Funding - Same as #3 in the Knight Appeal.

      4) The Court's rejection of the "institutional enhancement theory."

   c. The Alabama State University Board of Trustees appealed because of:

      1) The insufficiency of relief with respect to facilities, resources and funding, and program duplication.

      2) The continued operation of Troy State University at Montgomery.

      3) The failure of the Order to provide sufficient relief to enable the Board to carry out the Court's Order requiring further desegregation of Alabama State University.

d. The Alabama State Board of Education filed a cross appeal with the Eleventh Circuit regarding:

1) The determination of liability and liability for purposes of attorneys' fees, as to the Board, its members, the Chancellor, Athens State College, and Calhoun State Community college.

2) The granting of additional relief in favor of the private plaintiffs as against, and specifically related to the above defendants.

2. Motions to Stay the Order

Motions to seek a stay of the Court's Remedial Decree were filed by the State of Alabama, The University of Alabama and Troy State University, pending the final resolutions of the appeals that were filed with the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. The District Court denied the motions.

3. Motion for Modification of the Court's Remedial Decree

The United States proposed that language be added to the Court's Remedial Decree to address proposed and future proposed construction and expansion programs undertaken in the Montgomery and Huntsville areas. The motion, which was denied, would have given ACHE the authority to determine if such actions would unnecessarily duplicate programs already in place at ASU or A&M, or impede the desegregation of ASU and A&M. The Court ruled that it would be inappropriate to modify a Remedial Decree which is before the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, and over which that Court is exercising jurisdiction.

4. Interim Award of Attorneys' Fees

The Court granted interim awards of $500,000 and $100,000 to two of the Plaintiffs' attorneys. The fees are to be made available from the appropriations for "Operations and Maintenance and Program Support" from the Alabama Special Education Trust Fund for bachelor-degree granting institutions.

1993 Major actions included:

1. Court approval of approximately $2 million in legal fees and expenses for the Plaintiffs' attorneys based on time expended from 1988 through April 27, 1993.

2. Appellate Court hearing.

3. Appointment of a Special Monitor who shall observe, review, approve, report and make recommendations to the Court concerning compliance with the Decree and any subsequent modification of the Decree by the Court, the Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court.

1994 Major actions included:

1. The Eleventh Circuit of Appeals reversed or vacated, and remanded for District Court reconsideration, the following:

   a. Missions of AAMU & ASU, the Historically Black Institutions (HBI's).

   b. Land grant funding at AAMU & AU.

   c. Black history, culture and thought deficiencies in the curricula of the Historically White Institutions (HWI's).

2. The Court appointed five neutral expert witnesses and charged them with the task of providing a range of alternatives designed to reduce or dismantle to the greatest extent possible the segregative effects regarding the above issues. The witnesses submitted their individual reports to the Court in December 1994.

   a. MISSIONS OF THE HBI's - The full range of alternatives to enhance the missions of ASU and A&M include merging institutions, expanding missions through acquisitions, transferring academic programs from HWI's to ASU and AAMU, enhancing funding to ASU and AAMU, and linking community colleges to ASU and AAMU.

   b. ACES/AES- The witnesses concur that there should be a unified Agricultural Cooperative Extension Service and a unified Agricultural Experimental Station. This would enable AAMU University to enhance its contribution to the State and to receive additional funding. The University has proposed expanding its Urban Cooperative Extension Service Program on a state-wide basis and the witnesses support the expansion.

   c. CURRICULA- The Witnesses did not find that the curricula at the HWI's are generally deficient in the degree to which they incorporate black thought, culture and history. However, three of the four witnesses charged with reviewing this issue recognize that, based on additional information, the Court may determine a remedy is needed.

3. The Court denied a motion filed by Tuskegee University, a private black college (that receives some state funding), to intervene in the case since it is a land grant university.

1995 A re-hearing of the case began on January 30, 1995.

PBM
1/95

APPENDIX E

VERBATIM REPORTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE

Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee Survey
Alabama Commission on Higher Education

Responses from: Faculty/administrators in colleges or universities (N=32)

General Questions on Role and Effectiveness of the Commission

A. What is the most significant leadership/policy initiative undertaken by the Commission?

8 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Organizational restructuring of higher education. A committee comprised of college presidents was appointed a number of years ago to address the problem. After several meetings the group could not reach a consensus. To my knowledge no recommendation was made.

Orchestrating the coordination and uniform reporting of institutional data for all public institutions of higher education in the State, thereby, providing an objective means for assessment and comparison between and among institutions.

Working through institutional role and scope statements which provide a potential framework for rational programmatic decisions.

Control/Monitoring of Off-Campus Courses

Avoid duplication of ed (sic) programs where such duplication is wasteful; provide across the board directional leadership

Attempt to upgrade quality of higher ed. and eliminate wasteful duplication.

Its determined effort to effect a moratorium on new programs, levels, and institutions. Alabama has a glut of higher education opportunity!

It is difficult to determine what would have happened regardless of ACHE. I think that planning for telecommunications, for example, would have taken place anyway. Perhaps some controls, which are already eroding, on off-campus activity would be a major initiative.

1. Development of and ongoing refinement of the RAP formula
2. Attempts to control or limit the proliferation of branch campuses or off-campus centers by two-year and four-year institutions

2 year/4 year articulation

Present [sic] the duplication of programs

The Commission's leadership in working toward a more equitable funding formula for higher education has been most significant. This has not been an easy task in Alabama, where growth in real dollars for higher education has been minimal. The Commission's interaction with the Council of Presidents and the staff's efforts at involving institutions in fiscal analyses, have made difficult decisions possible.

Recognizing the need for increased support of the funding formula used for arriving at the annual budget recommendation submitted to the Governor and legislature during the past two years, the leadership of the Commission and its staff have brought together representatives of the institutions of higher education to revise the funding formula, to address formula concerns, and to achieve a more equitable distribution of public funds to meet the funding needs of institutions. These actions of the Commission have increased public support for higher education and for the Commission and represent the most significant leadership initiative undertaken by the Commission.

The attempt to get the Legislature to adopt formula funding for the various colleges & universities in the state. Appropriations should be based on real need and performance - not politics.

Development of formula for funding of institutions of higher education

To move towards equity funding for all senior institutions in the state with at least a 60% level.

Special Title VI funding proposal for the state's Historically Black Institutions (HBIs).

Unified budget

Unified budget for Universities

Student aid programs.

Serving as the State of Alabama Postsecondary Review Entity (SPRE).

Development of guidelines and procedures for the State Postsecondary Review Entity (SPRE).

Developed format and criteria for SPRE reviews. I am unaware of any significant initiative undertaken in the last few years.

Attempting to address waiver of out-of-state tuition for students who reside in contiguous states surrounding Alabama. The Commission wastes its time in micro-management of trivial matters to the point that significant leadership initiatives cannot be accomplished.

Statewide Articulation Reporting System (STARS), including Articulation and General Studies Committee

Attempts to define and classify institutional missions and roles for purposes of funding formula calculations and academic program approval. The Commission has been most successful at mission definition in the funding formula. Classification of institutional missions in instruction has been limited to attempts to fix instructional role based on program types and levels in place when the "instructional role matrices" were constructed in 1989.

B. What is the most significant leadership/policy issue still in need of attention by the Commission?

4 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Establishment/Assignment of geographical service areas to institutions

Technology in distance education and alternative delivery systems is advancing exponentially. Yet many of ACHE's policies are formulated in terms of geographic boundaries: 25-miles; within so may [sic] miles of an institution; etc... Because of airways, microwaves, and phone lines these restrictions are already obsolete. We in Alabama have just not yet recognized that fact. Someone must educate the educational and political leaders around this state to a new way of thinking about higher education—institutions without boundaries, without walls. This role may/should fall to ACHE.

Need to address the oversupply of 2 year community college programs in the state. These programs provide unnecessary duplication of services & are extremely costly. This should be part of State education reform.

Coordination w/ St. Board concerning duplication/efficiency of 2 yr colleges & technical institutes

Jr. College System having their own agenda - duplication - off campus locations at every crossroads.

The politicization of higher education, particularly by the two year college system. ACHE has no real political power and is regularly ignored by the Legislature.

Controlling the role, scope, and programmatic growth of the two-year sector.

Elimination of duplications in program offerings, especially in the out-of-control expansion of the two year colleges.

Bringing the two-year junior colleges under ACHE supervision.

Bringing two-year institutions under same governing structure as four-year institutions.

Articulation between 2 year & 4 year schools; overabundance of higher level programs such as medical and engineering at too many schools.

Standard core common to all public 2 year & 4 year institutions

2 yr - 4 yr issues
Review of existing programs of instruction, research, and service.

Proliferation of programs and campuses.

We have too many colleges of all kinds. ACHE has apparently given up any attempt to exert influence.

Providing leadership which will help bring about appropriate consolidation and more effective organization of higher education in the State. Clearly, the two-year college system is overbuilt, over-extended, and undercontrolled. Also, the funding formula continues to be weighted against regional universities and needs refinement to be more equitable.

Development of legislative funding recommendations based on the mission (role and scope) of institutions and less dependent on enrollment and the production of credit hours.

Identifying and supporting funding for new degree programs at the HBIs that do not affect the regular stream of funding of these institutions.

Funding policy for institutions of higher learning

Review of proposed SPRE Regulations

Encourage the development of two-year college programs, most of which are proposed based on community needs and requests. Encourage four-year institutions to verify that faculty conscientiously seek to improve teaching skills rather than devote most of their time to research in response to the publish-or-perish, get-a-grant-funded attitudes of academe.

Establishing a college and university information system.

Establishment of state-wide college information system and development of sensible guidelines for higher education.

Central clearinghouse for programs and information

Need <u>focused</u> statewide plan for higher education.

Becoming an advocate for higher education.

Support of current articulation efforts

Continued efforts to promote understanding of the mission of two-year colleges

The most significant issue still in need of attention by the Commission is the need for a statewide public awareness effort which presents the needs for higher education and the benefits derived from a strong system of higher education in Alabama. While complying with its statutory mandate, the Commission could and must become a more outspoken advocate for higher education and present a positive case for higher education to the citizens of Alabama. In a well planned public awareness campaign, the Commission could include, among other things, the contributions of higher education in improving the quality of life in Alabama, in maximizing human potential, in increasing economic development, in improving the State's tax base, and in insuring a more secure future and quality lifestyle for the citizens of Alabama. For the future of Alabama and the future of higher education, the Commission must become a high profile public advocate of higher education in Alabama.

The role, program scope, structure and performance of the State's two-year colleges, including the proliferation of off-campus courses. The policy issue is not simply access, but how much of the State's resources can be committed to sustaining access to postsecondary programs in the context of Alabama's need for graduates of two-year programs.

C. What is the most significant impediment to the effectiveness of the work of the Commission?

7 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Approving new programs without the ability to fund

Reluctant to play a strong positive leadership role in addressing the issues relative to the Title VI litigation in a manner that recognizes the present program and general support needs of HBIs that are a product of past funding inequities and denials.

Continuing civil rights litigation. Lack of organizational control over two-year institutions. Political clout and political involvement of the State Board members and two-year institutions.

It tends to favor a four year solution to almost every problem; ACHE lacks visionary leadership necessary to get all parts of higher ed working together

Control of the two-year college system by the State Board of Education

The wasteful expenditure of funds for patronage purposes on 2 year schools, and the lack of coordination of the entire system of higher education.

Too many institutions each with it's own political lineage.

The separation of the community colleges from the four year schools & universities.

Narrow view of commission members of role of 2 year colleges

ACHE's preferential treatment of four-year institutions over two-year institutions, which are, by the way, teaching most of the college-going population in Alabama.

The adversarial relationship that exists between the Alabama Commission on Higher Education and the Department of Postsecondary Education.

A lack of knowledge and understanding of the missions and educational systems they represent.

A lack of empirical data to substantiate decisions made by the Commission.

A lack of understanding or noncommitment to following procedures and or guidelines they themselves set.

The lack of an information-based, strategic concept for higher education to meet the State's needs. This fragments the program approval process into ad hoc debate about individual programs and institutional roles. It increases institutional competition and the potential for political pressure on the Commission and frequently casts ACHE into a negative role. Few recommendations have ever been made about what programs institutions should be developing.

Outside the halls of higher education, the work of the Commission is largely unknown. When received, publicity usually centers around the Commission's role as referee between two or more institutions, or news released portrays ACHE as an antagonist, if the medium reporting on the issue is a friend to an opposing viewpoint. The coordinating role, the peacemaking role, the leadership role of ACHE is a secret too well kept.

(1) The uncertainty of legislative support for their actions.
(2) A lack of breadth, maturity, and overriding concern for the good of the state (vs. concern for special interest) among the Commissioners.

The individual political agendas of certain members of the Commission.

They appear to be aligned with certain vested interests. They do not appear to be an articulate voice for an effective delivery of higher education.

The most significant impediment to the effectiveness of the work of the Commission is the failure of the leadership of the institutions of higher education, members of the legislature, and other public officials to accept the Commission as the primary authority on funding and regulations of higher education. This lack of support results from the failure of the Commission to build support and a consensus among its members, institutions of higher education, and public officials on long-range goals for higher education in Alabama.

The Commission is really a body without substantial power and probably needs to be replaced with a Board of Regents. Needs to be free from political pressure

Lack of authority from Legislature; it has no muscle with which to enforce its decisions.

Lack of Authority

Structural inability of the Commission to act independently from the inherent political pressures of the two-year college system and the influence of the doctoral and historically black universities.

Related to B above the Commission has established a perception contrary to statute that it is an oversight body such as a state corporation commission whose job is to protect the consumer.

The emphasis on "policing" - Limited educational vision

State Politics

Politics-

D. What is the most important difference the Commission has made in the development and performance of Alabama Postsecondary Education?

11 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

People now stop and consider what ACHE's position will be on some matters.

The Commission provides an open public forum on higher education for the State on a periodic basis which is vital for public accountability.

Implementation of program reviews, resulting in the elimination of low productivity programs

It has served as a central reviewer of programs and served as resource for gathering data on higher education in Alabama.

The ability to coordinate efforts in the state so that dollars for education go further.

The most important difference the Commission has made in the development and performance of Alabama Postsecondary Education results from the Commission's achieving a more equitable distribution of public funds allocated to higher education. While absolute equity has not been achieved for all schools, the Commission's efforts toward equitable funding have resulted in improved quality in institutions of higher education which formerly lacked the resources to achieve maximum enhancement of their programs and services. Enhanced quality of higher education in institutions which formerly lacked adequate

resources has made a tremendous difference in the development and performance of Alabama Postsecondary Education.

There now exists a process and dialog which has significantly reduced institutional appetites for programmatic growth and expansion.

Limiting proliferation of off-campus course offerings at locations throughout the State.

Attempting to minimize the proliferation of off-campus offerings, throughout the state.

Bringing order and restraint in two areas: off-campus offerings and new instructional programs.

Brought some (albeit limited) order to system of higher education

Attempt to come to terms with duplication of programs - success in articulation of courses between junior and senior institutions.

Controlling duplication of programs.

Its contribution to precluding unnecessary academic program duplication, and the related efforts to effect cooperation activities.

Despite our occasional chafing at deadlines and timeliness for reporting, the Commission has made us in higher education plan further ahead and plan more thoroughly. Through the process of documenting needs, success, concerns, etc., for presentation to ACHE, we more fully identify our priorities and our values. This is the heart of institutional effectiveness.

Encouraging voluntary cooperation among 4 year schools.

Perhaps made orderly program development more routine; most 2 year personnel believe ACHE hopes to dismantle the 2 year system thus it has little influence in this area.

Have made no positive impact on performance and have been seen as more of a hindrance than a help in the development of the two-year college system.

The increased political nature of the Commission has hindered objectivity in doing what needs to be done for the state as a whole.

None - To [sic] adversarial a relationship; failure to work together in a cooperative spirit

ACHE has established another layer of bureaucracy to impede the progress and efficiency of educational institutions in Alabama.

Providing the context for agreements among the senior institutions on the amount and distribution of the annual Unified Budget Recommendation, including funding for statewide programs for research and library enhancement.

Development and refinement of guidelines regarding off-campus instruction

Approval process for new programs

Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee Survey
Alabama Commission on Higher Education

Responses from: Member of state legislature (N=14)

General Questions on Role and Effectiveness of the Commission

A. What is the most significant leadership/policy initiative undertaken by the Commission?

8 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Trying to control duplication of services offered by Junior Colleges. And increase in growth of branch campuses.

Restricting further repetition of course work & duplication of effort in every Sr. & Jr. College. Having University's [sic] work together on budget proposals. Handling student aid grants.

The viability study, articulation study & the Junior exit exams

Unified budget recommendations and articulation agreements.

Approving new course studies including doctoral studies

By asserting its statutory authority with post secondary education. Please keep it up! As long as the State Bd. & Fred Gainous can do what they wish, then ACHE will be perceived as a toothless tiger.

B. What is the most significant leadership/policy issue still in need of attention by the Commission?

7 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

By insisting that post secondary either be under the control of ACHE or that it have a separate board.

Trying to control duplication of services offered by Junior Colleges. And increase in growth of branch campuses.

Eliminating duplication of programs.

More work in A above and more authority to restrict programs & courses.

Power to make funding formula policies
Power to regulate programs at various institutions

Need to strengthen it's powers via new statute

To level the playing field between traditionally white flag ship institutions and state supported and affiliated black institutions

C. What is the most significant impediment to the effectiveness of the work of the Commission?

5 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Higher education institutions (2 yr.)

Appointed board of ACHE vs the elected school board and legislators employed by post secondary - This often results in a situation where ACHE has the statutory [sic] authority but Fred Gainous has the real authority. ACHE must get its authority from the courts then it should not back down to post secondary.

Institutional turf protection.

Raw politics

The Legislature

The lack of authority to regulate and make the regulation stick -

Lack of power to enforce decisions.

Lack of authority from state Legislature to enforce leadership/policy issues

Not enough autonomy granted by legislature - legislative intervention in funding process

D. What is the most important difference the Commission has made in the development and performance of Alabama Postsecondary Education?

8 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Advisory agency - good information, no power to enforce recommendations

Successfully defending ACHE's right to approve new programs

The Commission has forced the legislature to look more closely at duplication and at proliferation of course work and branch and off-campus programs.

Program review and unified budget recommendations.

Prison education

Postsecondary education must be reformed!

Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee Survey
Alabama Commission on Higher Education

Responses from: Civic, media, business leader (N=15)

General Questions on Role and Effectiveness of the Commission

A. What is the most significant leadership/policy initiative undertaken by the Commission?

8 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Data collection

Attempt to unify higher education budget process.

Attempt to present coordinated higher education budgets to the Legislature and have them accepted by both the legislators and the colleges.

1) Influenced legislative leaders to utilize base plus benefits of budgeting
2) Program viability analysis
3) Continuing diligence to student loan and financial aid programs

Attempt to prevent any further duplication of courses of study.

Combining of or elimination of tech schools

My perception is that the Commission has not provided any significant leadership, initiative, vision or direction.

B. What is the most significant leadership/policy issue still in need of attention by the Commission?

6 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

To have a state wide plan for higher education and the power to implement it.

Unified higher education governance

Overall governance of higher education, especially the proliferation of campuses.

Duplication of programs & costs

Articulation between two and four year colleges and universities

How to deal effectively with the problem of having more 2 year colleges than the state needs or can afford.

The absolute necessity to deal with the excessive number of junior colleges!

Ability to prevent college administrators from circumventing the Commission.

Have high school graduates who can solve basic math problems and write correct grammar

C. What is the most significant impediment to the effectiveness of the work of the Commission?

4 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Politics

Lack of real power

Lack of legal authority; legislative meddling.

No legislative power

Lack of legislative authority to control higher ed.

1. LEGISLATURE

An ineffective State Legislature that chooses to feather its own nest rather than take bold stands

The lack of leadership and good judgment in the state legislature (especially re junior colleges).

1) The Legislature and the attitudes of its members concerning ACHE
2) The Legislature needs to recognize the importance of ACHE and its policy role, thereby providing further credibility to the work of the Commission.

Lack of political will - the appointment process - Little direction - little vision.

Lack of unified governance

D. What is the most important difference the Commission has made in the development and performance of Alabama Postsecondary Education?

8 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

1) The Commission has created a climate of cooperation and harmony whereby institutions can interact with one another to develop the best policies and programs.

2) The diligence and dedication in developing a unified budget has been a benefit to reducing tensions and providing a comprehensive, collaborative budget presentation for higher education.

Provides some information to policy makers

Has helped restore some sanity to what previously was a runaway vehicle.

Some control over the proliferation of new academic offerings.

Slowed growth of duplication

I'm not aware of any real difference made -

I'm not aware of any. Notwithstanding the state legislature, the Commission should exercise leadership and courage re the junior college problem.

Sixth Quadrennial Evaluation Committee Survey
Alabama Commission on Higher Education

Responses from: Other/Unspecified (N=14)

General Questions on Role and Effectiveness of the Commission

A. What is the most significant leadership/policy initiative undertaken by the Commission?

1 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Strategic plan & hiring Dr. Hector

Presentation of budget to the Legislature which has been approved by most of the institutions

UBR

1. Getting consensus on UBR w COP, Gov. and Leg.
2. Coordinating the direction of Higher Education.
3. Emphasis on articulation, accreditation and elimination of duplication

Recently - articulation agreements between all state institutions

Trying to limit the expansion of facilities and programs

Control of proliferation of new programs

New program approval

Approval of programs in 2 year postsecondary program; process of getting Council of Presidents to support a funding formula

NAAL - or program viability standards

ACHE was put into place for advisory purposes.

No truly significant initiative apparent to me.

The important leadership initiatives undertaken by the Commission have come largely from the universities, not the Commission. Perhaps the only exception to this is in the area of financial assistance for university students.

B. What is the most significant leadership/policy issue still in need of attention by the Commission?

1 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Address low graduation rates statewide, despite amount of money allocated to higher education

Lack of control over two year institutions in matters of budget, campus expansion, buildings etc.

Trying to limit the expansion of facilities and programs

Control of proliferation of new programs

Control of expansion of 2 yr. college system & their off-campus programs. Allied health programs

The Commission clearly has no understanding of the mission and purpose of community colleges, and little appreciation of the philosophy of the community college. It often appears to be openly hostile to community colleges and is obviously operating under a university model which it attempts to impose on community colleges. The Commission regularly attempts to micromanage institutions and to usurp the authority of the State Board of Education.

Reducing the excessive proliferation of off-campus programs/offerings by junior colleges and Troy State. The expansionist movement calls into question the State's ability/willingness to fund post-secondary education at a respectable level of quality given the scope and quantity of offerings.

Self-interest of legislators employed by higher education or audits of credit hour production

State plan for delivery of Environmental Science & Allied Health programs

Coordination and articulation of programs; need for authority to close (rather than just approve programs; institutional accountability requirements

1. Need authority and responsibility to eliminate as well as approve programs

Review/re-authorization of existing programs

Providing more advisory information.

C. What is the most significant impediment to the effectiveness of the work of the Commission?

1 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Empire building by various administrations
Turf protection by the same, lack of cooperation-
Federal law suit
1. State Board of Education
2. Department of Postsecondary Education
3. State Legislature

POLITICS

Ineptitude of State Board of Education - (re. post-secondary schools) - quality of Boards of Trustees lack of orientation to their role

The Commission clearly has no understanding of the mission and purpose of community colleges, and little appreciation of the philosophy of the community college. It often appears to be openly hostile to community colleges and is obviously operating under a university model which it attempts to impose on community colleges. The Commission regularly attempts to micromanage institutions and to usurp the authority of the State Board of Education.

Politics in 2 & 4 yr systems, legislature

Politics and lack of state-wide leadership demanding quality for the educational dollar.

Excessive involvement and control by politicians and probably too little authority to really coordinate higher ed. For example, compare AACHE's [sic] statutory role and mission with that of Tennessee's counterpart - TCHE [sic]

Political power of institutions - ie Constitutional Board of Trustees; inability to get meaningful governance legislation

An absolutely terrible system of governance

Lack of governance in legislation

1. Lack of time Commissioners have to focus on a sophisticated subject as higher education

Its efforts to expand beyond its intended role.

Review/re-authorization of existing programs

D. What is the most important difference the Commission has made in the development and performance of Alabama Postsecondary Education?

1 No opportunity to observe or no opinion

Curbed some expansions, reduced number of programs offered - made them more cooperative with the Commission and caused them to prove their case when applying for new courses

Placing some "brakes" on institutions ambitious growth plans as institutions look only at their own wants and needs. ACHE looks at the entire state picture.

Encourage more emphasis on quality - less emphasis on quantity. Less unnecessary duplication

We have kept a finger in the dike to prevent a flood of political abuse within the system

1. Agreement on UBR
2. ACHE's role as a leader in the coordination and development of higher education policy in the state.

Focusing public attention on the most egregious problems; and supporting the best practices-

Some success in bringing the schools, especially the 4 year institutions, together to work cooperatively, i.e. unified budget

Developed better cooperation among Presidents re funding

President's Council

Better working relationship between regional and 4 yr. research institutions

ACHE has made it too burdensome for education to respond to changing needs in a timely manner.

No really discernable difference apparent to me.

The Commission has been an impediment to postsecondary education in Alabama. The Commission has yet to recognize the community colleges as a significant catalyst to economic development in the state and insists upon a university model of program approval requiring a ten month wait between program submission and program approval, completely out of touch with local economic needs. In similar fashion it imposes a university model of program review, judging programs only in terms of the number of degrees they award, again completely out of touch with postsecondary occupational/vocational trends.

Alabama Commission on Higher Education
3465 Norman Bridge Road
Montgomery, Alabama 36105-2310
(334) 281-1921